THE DUTY OF THE EDUCATED MIND

CHARLES W. PIPKIN

THE DUTY OF THE EDUCATED MIND

Copyright, 1936, by Louisiana State University Press
Reissued in 1972 by Kennikat Press by arrangement
Library of Congress Catalog Card No: 76-86053
ISBN 0-8046-1681-7

Manufactured by Taylor Publishing Company Dallas, Texas

"The Educated Mind and a Planned Society" was the baccalaureate address at the first conferring of degrees at a summer school commencement at the Louisiana State University, August 4, 1932; "The Southern Philosophy of States' Rights: the Old Sectionalism and the New Regionalism" was a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, December 27, 1933; "Cooperative Citizenship in a Biracial Society" was an address at the Conference of State Superintendents of Public Instruction in the South, Peabody College, Nashville, July, 1933; "The New Deal: an Estimate in 1934" was an address before the Institute of Citizenship, Emory University, Atlanta, February 14, 1934; "The Logic of Capitalism" appeared in The Social Frontier *of October, 1935, as a review of Professor Harold J. Laski's* The State in Theory and in Practice; *"Legislation and Social Economic Planning" appeared in* The Southwest Review, *April, 1933; "The Challenge of Childhood to Louisiana" was an address before the Louisiana State Conference of Social Work, Shreveport, October 20, 1933; "Social Legislation in the South" was issued in February, 1936, by the Southern Policy Committee as the third in a series of Southern Policy Papers; "Education in a World of Insecurity" was the baccalaureate address at*

the Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, Monticello, May 18, 1936; "The Tradition of Scholarship in a World of Insecurity" was the baccalaureate address at the University of Mississippi, Oxford, June 1, 1936; and "The Ethics of Internationalism" was an address before the Institute of Public Affairs, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, March 11, 1936.

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD 1

PROBLEMS OF POLICY

THE EDUCATED MIND AND A PLANNED SOCIETY 7

THE SOUTHERN PHILOSOPHY OF STATES' RIGHTS: THE OLD SECTIONALISM AND THE NEW REGIONALISM 17

COOPERATIVE CITIZENSHIP IN A BIRACIAL SOCIETY . . . 27

THE NEW DEAL: AN ESTIMATE IN 1934 35

THE LOGIC OF CAPITALISM 48

THE LEGISLATIVE WAY

LEGISLATION AND SOCIAL ECONOMIC PLANNING 57

THE CHALLENGE OF CHILDHOOD TO LOUISIANA . . . 83

SOCIAL LEGISLATION IN THE SOUTH 91

EDUCATION AND INSECURITY

EDUCATION IN A WORLD OF INSECURITY 157

THE TRADITION OF SCHOLARSHIP IN A WORLD OF INSECURITY 166

THE ETHICS OF INTERNATIONALISM 175

FOREWORD

It was Voltaire who said reason and humanity are a single word. The long record of the political evolution of forms of government does not show that there has been much of reason, and even less of humanity, in the states of the world.

The postwar world has been a laboratory of experiment in nation-making. The nineteenth century was a period which unified peoples over large areas into political unity. These nation-states in 1914 attempted to carry forward in the twentieth century the war process. War may have been in earlier centuries a cohesive force, but in a mechanized world it is a powerful disintegrating influence within a nation and among nations.

Four years of war created a postwar world of revolution. Currents of revolution flow high and dark around the world today. They are not to be stopped by any one nation's attempting to isolate itself from the family of nations. It is not in self-deluding national philosophies that a people can choose its own destiny in the twentieth century. We stand at the end of an old era of nationalism; but it is not proved that the new postwar nationalisms have the strength and health in them that will give security to the peoples of the nation-states of the world.

The present spirit of inflamed nationalism may be as pitiless in its destruction as war. In fact, it is war against civilization and all the more a desperately cruel phenomenon, because the victims of nationalism are the peoples themselves within the nation, as well as the frustrated hopes of an organized world society.

It is not surprising that the World War has been followed by a frenzied revival of nationalism. Within each country all of the material aids and the subtle energies of spirit were resources of war. The individual was lost. Force was deified. Force triumphantly shackled in the war not only nations but the individuals within every nation to the blind fury of war. The result was self-destruction of the democratic state and annihilation of the individual.

It is upon such a background of hate and of fear and of despair that the individual has had to recapture personality and citizenship in the modern world, against the current philosophies of national life that have come crashing through the postwar world, a world desperately in hunger and despairing of any tolerable prospect for the great mass of the people.

Nationalism today has necessarily followed upon the era of war-making and peace-making which disregarded the rights of individuals. This is a crude beginning for principles of citizenship to have much validity for the individual. It is the individual who has been victimized. It is the state as a great voluntary agency of men of good will that has defaulted. There has emerged again a blind worship of the state. Once

again are heard the echoes of feudalism—the sound sometimes strangely comforting to modern ears. But the fact remains that men look again for a strange magic in governmental organization, and they affect to see some supernatural benevolence in forms of governmental control. It is in some such ardor of state worship in peace times that the individual is also victimized. In war it was the force of destruction in which the individual was lost. In peace it is the unthinking reverence which is given to the nation as the be all and the end all of the individual's existence. It is not strange, then, that the world today lacks moral and spiritual appeasement. The individual in such a world is in conflict with himself, and on every hand he is met by the onrush of political forces unfriendly to his worth and his dignity as an individual.

The papers in this volume have been selected from articles and addresses prepared since 1932. I want to express my gratitude to my friend and colleague, Dr. Marcus M. Wilkerson, Director of the Louisiana State University Press, who has sympathetically given this group of papers the final form of publication, and who has associated this effort with the work of the Graduate School. Mr. James Ellis Palmer of the Louisiana State University Press staff generously undertook the task of collecting these papers, and I am greatly obliged to him for his cooperation.

It is with hesitation that these papers are given this present form. They may suggest, I hope, the present duty of the university-trained mind in this uncertain

and insecure period of world history. The age-old quest for liberty seems at times confused and balked. The great hope is that men of good will and reason will not despair.

CHARLES W. PIPKIN

The Graduate School
Louisiana State University
July 12, 1936

PROBLEMS OF POLICY

THE EDUCATED MIND AND A PLANNED SOCIETY

THE world that the industrial revolution created in the nineteenth century ended with the war. A shot fired in a Serbian village was a signal that the world of before 1914 had determinedly set upon its self-destruction. The years from 1914 to 1918 saw nations in mad cyclonic rage using modern inventions to kill, and manufacturing terrible agencies of poison propaganda to undermine the foundations of truth in human relations. The venom of war was in the peace which came after the war. Men and nations blindly sought to make of their common destruction a thing of profit until now in despair the whole world faces the common guilt of having attempted by injuring others to advance the security of themselves in isolation. A false and fictitious prosperity was for a short time a mask to hide the malignant wounds of a war-torn and peace-mad world. But today the world faces the future in a new mood.

The world today has gone far from the blatant prosperity confidence in machinery and in systems. A world-wide depression, of which the United States is a necessary part, is an indictment of the purposive energies of education and business and government

in the twentieth century. There is a philosophy of the depression which would counsel caution, and with little vision there are leaders who by their action prove that at heart they have never believed in a better order of society. Whatever the issues of the future may be for the educated mind, the problems of these times cannot be solved by caution or by cowardice. There is no way out but in the courage of attempting to build a saner and a juster world. To accept defeat for social ideals would be a way of tragedy. There is a way out. It is in the power of the educated mind to plan a new society. This new society can only be created by courage, for it is certain that if a better world is not fashioned from these changing times, there is no alternative but to accept from cowardice and from compromise and from despair a world that is not fit to live in.

It is not simply that the old order has been repudiated; it is rather that men of good will and of social idealism and alert economic intelligence have condemned the old order, because it is morally and politically and economically bankrupt. It has no motive power for the future.

This indictment against an unplanned society can be explained in three ways. First, the democratic society of the twentieth century did not organize for peace, and war has almost destroyed it. War has taught that the anarchy and despotism it makes necessary are the allies of the reactionary forces which war shields in human society. Evils which have no basic connec-

tion with democratic government have been alleged to be the necessary outgrowth of democracy, but they are in reality the ugly bastard children of war and democracy.

The second indictment has been that capitalism in democracy has broken down beyond repair. The economic system, which in a highly technological society had the ethics of banditry, has been declared morally wrong, and it is also powerless to direct its strength. Democracy has attempted the impossible task of trying to make an industrial feudal system founded on profits a motive power of twentieth-century production. The profit motive in a modern industrial society has become as morally indefensible in economics as war has become morally reprehensible in the field of governmental relations. Hunger and dispossession, unemployment and poverty, wasted human resources and insecurity for workers and all citizens have been the results of a demoralized industrial system in the twentieth-century democratic society.

The third indictment against an unplanned society has been in a lack of noble motives behind the forces of education and business and government and religion. The present scene is a bankrupt scene because modern civilization forgot the individual and attempted to create a Frankenstein out of the citizen of the twentieth century. If democratic government is to survive, the citizen must find a new meaning in his citizenship, and his needs must be the primary concern of the new social order. Government and business

and education are merely means of making possible the good life for men and women. It is then a foremost duty to plan with courage and intelligence how these forces can build a new world in which there is a justice and a security which make individuals happy and nations at peace with all neighbors. A planned society is the only alternative to the old order. And it must be a planned society which gives the first place to the individual and social values, putting man and his rights above all else; because a planned society that is not directed by socially minded men and women can again bankrupt the world and again raise the standards of the machine above the spirit of man.

There is no need to review the past and the present in terms of the indictment of their motive power and their achievement, unless we may set before us the vision of a planned society in which reason and intelligence and love, and, if nothing else, common sense, are the dominant qualities of a new world order. The educated mind must look necessarily to a new world of education and business and religion and politics. It is then the chief duty of the educated mind in these times to create the conditions which make a planned society possible. The obligations of the educated mind were never more insistently social. There can be no isolation of the scholar from the chaos of the world in which he lives. He is part of its anarchy, and he must become an important factor in the world's progress toward sanity.

A socially planned society under conditions of lib-

erty is an alluring prospect to the educated mind. It challenges the whole power of leadership and opens the tremendous possibilities of a new social control through intelligence and imagination. But today a socially planned society is more than a dream. It is a common-sense necessity. It is a way out. A complex and highly interdependent industrial system cannot direct itself. It has neither mind nor soul. Industry demands a planned society if there is to be any tolerable security for the worker and any hope of efficient world economy. Nations are neighbors, and there must be international cooperation if there is safety for any people. This is necessarily a part of social planning. Finally, the undeveloped resources of power in democratic society, represented by the Church, the School, the Press, and Government, are only futile agencies of control if behind their activity is not the purposive social energy and idealism which make them part of man's control of his destiny. It is the supreme duty of the educated mind today to undertake social planning under conditions of democracy and liberty. If social planning for a better world fails, there is nothing left but the dictatorship of force in human life and in social institutions. The choice is before us now. Will the educated mind fail modern civilization in its greatest crisis? It is altogether possible that unless intelligence is quickly directed through social planning to business and government and education, attacking fundamentally such problems as war, poverty, ignorance, unemployment and crime, modern civiliza-

tion will revert to primitive standards of control and culture. What of the future?

The work that is called education is one of the outstanding challenges to the educated mind in social planning. So much lip-service has been paid public education in democracy that it is difficult to say the plain truth about its power and its opportunity in a planned society. But now it is more important to be critically minded of the public school and university system in democracy, because they have failed in their duty to instruct and to guide. Where is the unafraid leadership they should provide? And what ideals of economic and social progress have the teachers of American democracy made real in American life? The public school in our democracy is not the dynamic community power it could be, and often it is more a defender of prejudice and popular ignorance than it is a training ground for keen-minded youth to know their rights and their duties. A generation of great adventuring in public education would help mightily to advance economic justice for the common people and develop the cultural life of America. A blind belief in the mechanism of the public school system has taken the place of a crusading faith in the possibilities of popular education in democracy.

The prophetic power of teaching must be restored. A new world is always before the eyes of youth if there are teachers who believe that youth can build a new

world. Education is now the desperate hope of a world that has repudiated its past, is dismayed by its present troubles, and is afraid of its future. Fearlessly the teaching function in democracy must be restored. The teacher cannot abdicate. The teacher must teach. The public school system can be the powerful agency of creating the conditions which will make a planned society possible in this nation. What greater task is before the socially minded teacher than to interpret the promise of American life in terms of a fuller sense of justice and to help build a saner world from the village to national and world capitals?

In American democracy there is no more important problem of social planning than that the United States take its place as a world power; and it is inevitable that America cooperate in world affairs. The fallacy of isolation in international affairs has never been a more dangerous element in American thought than it is today when the world is in revolution. The United States with its 120,000,000 people cannot live as a Robinson Crusoe nation. Isolation is not a policy, it is a terrible penalty of narrow nationalism. There is no way to security and prosperity for the American people but in international cooperation. The world is a unit in trade and commerce and the welfare of the United States is inevitably bound up with the progress of sanity and international organization. The agencies of world peace are being strengthened, but they will never function in their full power until the United

States joins the League of Nations and the World Court.

The narrow nationalistic appeal of politicians in these times of depression is unpatriotic. The politicians who talk of "entangling alliances" are tragically appealing to prejudice and ignorance. In these times of world chaos, to attempt to gain office by fostering narrow nationalistic and bitter international feeling is the sure mark of the demagogue.

There is no way to world recovery and world security but in peace. This peace must be based upon the facts of our present interdependent world. It seems to me essential that an American program of social planning for peace at home and abroad include the following:

First: A real and progressive reduction in armaments, lifting this huge burden from the backs of labor and industry. Armaments will defeat all social vision in democracy by perpetuating war as an institution. The greatest enemy of democracy is war. Armaments today are the greatest single obstacle to world economic recovery because they breed distrust among the nations.

Second: A repudiation of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, and a direct leadership on the part of the United States to break down the tariff and trade barriers which are destroying world trade. Tariffs are menacing every nation, and at the time that international trade and commerce must be revived. Here international action is, of course, the first essential.

Third: Cancellation of the war debts in proportion to the reduction in armaments by the countries of Europe. They never will be collected, and now they may be used as diplomatic and economic bargaining points by the United States. Cancellation on such conditions would hasten world recovery.

Fourth: Immediate adherence to the World Court. This nation must take the lead in the settlement of disputes through this one established agency of judicial settlement of international conflicts.

Fifth: Cordial and complete cooperation with the League of Nations in all its efforts for the established peace of the world, and full adherence in membership in the League. Fifty-six nations are now members, and it is the one existing international agency by which the peace of the world is safeguarded. The peace of the world can only come through organization, and any future peace is through the institutions set up to create the conditions of peace.

Sixth: Leadership that is alert and imaginative in reorganizing world trade through international conferences on silver and gold and the development of international trade agreements.

Seventh: Immediate recognition of Russia. This is plain common sense and is dictated by the selfish policy of the best interests of the nation. Recognition never implies acceptance of the manners or morals of a people. It is simply the first condition of carrying on necessary relationships.

Eighth: Finally, at home a liberal, and, if necessary,

a radical program of social and economic reform. This must include national and state and local planning for a more equitable distribution of wealth and the promotion of the aims of the great mass of the people for economic security and happiness. Democracy must function in terms of the twentieth century.

Man must control his future by social planning. A planned society is the only society that can meet the needs of industry and commercial life, and if America fails to build a cooperative economic system there is no way to recovery and security for the nation. In this world we live in—the fourth decade of the twentieth century—the adventure of experiment must be found again in American life. Democracy must always be experimental and courageous. The depressions of business, the defeat of social ideals by war and poverty, can only be guarded against by an alert and experimenting people. The future of democracy rests with bold economic and social experiment.

The old world has passed away. Men are determined that a new world is to be, and that this new world will give a larger place to a justice and a good will and a security that can be translated into daily bread. The educated mind with great devotion and with adventurous enthusiasm can lead the way to this new world.

THE SOUTHERN PHILOSOPHY OF STATES' RIGHTS: THE OLD SECTIONALISM AND THE NEW REGIONALISM

THE breakdown of what Rupert B. Vance in his *Human Geography of the South* calls "undifferentiated nationalism" has made it possible to discuss in a fresh way the meaning of regionalism in the life of the United States. It is also a fortunate thing that national experiment along social and economic lines has taken place at this same time. The conflict of interests is clearer not only among the groups which battle for control on the industrial front because of the various plans of national recovery, but also among the various regions of the country in the solution of their particular problems of economic and social adjustment.

The problem is mainly a consideration of the Old Sectionalism of the South and the New Regionalism of the South today. The Old Sectionalism had its dogmas, and these were the outgrowth of conditions of climate and agriculture and race which made a common way of life lead to a common way of understanding on many questions.

But there were as many conflicting and contradictory influences in the Old Sectionalism as there are now in the New Regionalism. Economic conflict

among classes and exploitation of the lesser dog have marked the growth of a common consciousness of section and region in the South as in the North. And the powerful force of self-interest among the exploiters has served to create a class dominated by power and profit-seeking, and not at all different in social outlook or morality from similar classes in any region or in any country.

It is necessary plainly to say that dominant self-seeking interests have come to an understanding of their special interests in both the North and the South. There may have been a time when there was a real conflict in the profits of the merchants and bankers of the industrial North and the profits of the agrarian South, but the expanding home markets of the whole United States, the spread of the factory system, together with a vast commercial agricultural economy in the South and Middle West, all have combined to make the struggle for economic control and profits the same the nation over.

The economic and social life of the South can quickly be oversimplified by special pleaders, not only as the historian sees the ante-bellum South, but also as recent history records the sordid tale of petty profits and incompetent leadership from the restoration of home rule in state governments down to the frenzied period of postwar industrial expansion in the South. Beneath the surface Southern life and politics and industry have teemed with conflict. The very fact that a large sectional economic interest, agriculture,

based for the most part on slave labor, made the South self-conscious in its behalf in a national policy of slavery, has obscured the contending forces at the same time of the free worker and the rising manufacturer in the South.

It can be said with a large measure of certainty that the particularism of the South has been a by-product of economic forces rather than any direct result of a theory of social and economic organization. The fact that there seems to be a closer identity of social prejudices and traditions between Louisiana and Virginia, a distance of hundreds of miles, than there is between Virginia and Pennsylvania, is significant now largely in terms of what kind of social order these prejudices and traditions may establish. The sense of the conscious region is the most powerful social force that the South possesses in common. A vast geographical area, from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, itself made up of empires, nevertheless feels the common bond of regional identity. The more urgent inquiry is not what has produced a Solid South, but what is to create an alert and secure population in this domain. It is here that the impact of industrialism has been most cruelly a weapon to divide a people. The Bourbonism of the industrialist has easily joined hands with the demagogue in religion and race, and each has made havoc of the common life of leisure and good taste in the South. The South as a region of community interests, a product of fortunate immigrations and migrations, made more conscious of its likenesses by a defeat in

a war between states, and by a powerful race of black color in its midst—this South as a regional community has been terribly exploited. The tragic era was not a brief span of years for the South and the nation, with a set beginning and a definite end; rather, the tragic era is the whole period of American history when there was no effective intelligent protest against the mad race for superficial national unity on the basis of unenlightened and undifferentiated national capitalism.

The first phase of the early period of growing centralization of legislative and administrative powers at Washington, roughly from 1890 to 1914, was a period of political and economic recovery in the South under the most mediocre and unimaginative leadership. The concept of regionalism in any but a sentimental hero-worship of the Lost Cause was not a vital force in the thinking of the people of the South. There was the anarchy of sectionalism under the worst possible auspices of politics and religion. And at the same time that the South was merely an on-looker of the expanding national sense in commerce and finance, the dictates of corporate wealth and of organized financial investment on the sole basis of profits was not seriously challenged in the nation. In fact, it seemed that the prosperous agricultural empire of the Middle West was as closely allied with the get-rich-quick philosophy of a whole nation of sectional anarchy as any New York banker could wish. Only when agriculture failed as a money producer was there any but formal lip service to it as a basis of national security and a way of self-

contained living. The Populist revolt and the leadership of Bryan were interruptions of the stride of national capitalism, whose center was in New York, whose soul was nowhere. The basis of its strength was in the agricultural surpluses of the nation which could be used to bring European capital to this country. The success story was so alluring that the South did not know the end of the chapter had been for the most part written before the South became an active character in the book.

The brief period of peace-time influence under Woodrow Wilson, and the rapid growth of administrative power in his efforts for the New Freedom at home and the world scene of his war powers as President, was not an era of thinking in the South. The spoils of Democratic victory were too sweet to cause the South to reflect seriously on the course of national destiny. This destiny besides had already been charted by forces outside the South which were not going to be effectively challenged until the Depression beginning in 1929. The South has really only become conscious of its solid source of power in its peoples and its material resources as a region when a so-called new nationalism has made a new regionalism inevitable. When a nation begins to talk of self-sufficiency and a planned economy, the genius of the South as a region begins to define its future in terms of its cultural past and of its present economic prospects.

It is thus that the South sees its part in the national scene—a region conscious of its interests in terms of

national subsidy and yet with a design for government. If there is to be any national planning there is the intelligent insistence that regional planning is the basis of its program and will be the measure of its aims at national security of a standard of life. From a defence of the temporary expediency of slavery to the logic of plowing up cotton is not a long way to go. Federal subsidies to the farmer are part of a regional program for agriculture just as the tariff has been a regional flattery to special privileged groups who always have hastened to interpret national interest in terms of the welfare they knew best, their own.

The old philosophy of states' rights was the product of the Old Sectionalism. It has had no meaning since Appomattox. Where it has been used it has been the reactionary bulwark raised by outside industrial interests who have seen the docile South as a labor supply or as a profitable field of investment exploitation. The increasing concentration of government at Washington has not alarmed the South because it has been seen as part of the changing function of government to meet human needs. It is not the growing concentration of administration; it is the failure of a philosophy of government adequate to a way of life that the South understands which is of importance today. This failure of a philosophy of government runs from local to international affairs, and it is just this failure which has brought again into prominence not a philosophy of the Old Sectionalism but an interpretation of the New Regionalism.

The philosophy of states' rights was used to promote the special and particular interests of the ante-bellum South. It was an attempt to interpret Sectionalism. It was at its best an intellectual effort to understand the needs of the Section. It was intended to serve as a philosophy of government. But to attempt to use it as a guide to social policy from 1880 on in the South is to ignore the fundamental interests of the people of the South. It may have served before as an interpretation of the relationships between states in the Federal union; it is totally useless as a social philosophy of a region conscious of its needs in the twentieth century.

Thus the philosophy of the New Regionalism does not attempt any formal loyalty to a written document. It is certainly the freshest outlook on a troubled world today in the South because the philosophy of the New Regionalism sees the whole life of a people in terms of their cultural and economic background, and takes account of the imponderables of a region's history. Of course the varied forces of history and adventure which go to make this region even in this mass age of production the most unified on the continent are not to be brought within too neat a pattern. But there is this one thing in common which the South as a conscious regional community possesses, and that is a view of life and a way of life which are definitely set out against the uniform background of a national scene unrelieved by regional variety and diversity.

What are the objectives of the current ventures in social control? Are they an answer to the persistent

economic and social problems presented by modern capitalism? Does the internal composition of the dominant national political parties preclude a more basic and far-reaching program for the socialization of industry and life? None of the minor parties has as yet much political significance—not nearly enough to qualify as a vital instrument of social change. It is then all the more necessary that the South understand its strength in terms of a region, and organize its efforts for adequate influence in the program of national recovery. Whatever may be the results of a shortsighted policy of economic nationalism, the fact is plain that the South is a great producer of the raw materials of export. Any national industrial policy which ignores the South's supply of cotton, lumber, rice, and sugar, and the employment and support of her population in the varied activities of their production, is doomed to opposition by the South. Likewise any system of cultural and social rehabilitation which comes from such government administrations as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Emergency Relief Administration and the Civil Works Administration is likely to be regarded as alien to the real needs and interests of the South if its bureaucratic officialdom is appointed from outside its region and ready-made social patterns from the East or Middle West given to a resentful people.

This problem is acute. A vast overofficialdom now sits in Washington and directs the South in banking and farm loans, in agriculture and planting, in oil and lumber; and the whole program of relief and public

works is from the nation's capital. In this emergency of financial and agricultural bankruptcy, when unemployment is widespread and governmental relief the order of the day, it is hard for the South to revolt against what may be called a benevolent dictatorship of the New Deal. But if this organized dictatorship is to be a foreign missionary enterprise, joined in by the benevolent captains of industry and banking whose interests are directly joined to national investment and banking and industrial concerns, then it is far better for the South to build her future around safer institutions of her own design and purpose. Nor must the specious pleas about her Negro population and her lower costs of living and production be used to force a whole region into a permanent racial peonage, or to accept an inferior bargaining position for economic justice and for a culture which means a larger dignity for human beings.

It is a very suggestive contribution that the philosophy of the New Regionalism gives to the New Nationalism which is attempting to coordinate the agencies of recovery, because the interests of the South as a region are not provincial interests. They are broad in their economic importance in the producing capacity of the nation, and there is a wide variety of agricultural and industrial interest.

It is in the social philosophy of the New Regionalism that there is unsuspected power of a spiritual sort. The recapture of enthusiasm about the state and what the destiny of the state may be is basic to any way

of life that is tolerable in this century. Here the demand that government take account of the quality of life has its best expression in our times. There may be sharper demands for security in terms of work and in maintenance by the state, but the social philosophy of the New Regionalism inquires about the good life.

The importance of this contribution is patent now. In matters of national policy the South is becoming increasingly conscious of its power, and yet intelligent Southerners are thoroughly aware of the poor bargaining position of the South where matters of national policy are up for decision. It is apparent that there is a great handicap in administration because the South must accept policies she has not actively helped to formulate. Far too often the missionaries of the recurrent new deals come laden to her borders with the distasteful odor of their own regional evangelism, sanctified by being called administrators of national policy.

COOPERATIVE CITIZENSHIP IN A BIRACIAL SOCIETY

THE crisis in democratic government today is a crisis of citizenship. The decisions that democracies make seem to come from sources of power which are not controlled by the people, and the decisions are determined by partial interests and by selfish purposes of minority groups and by the whims of temporary despots. The tragic fact of citizenship in the twentieth century is that the great mass decisions of people have been blind and stupid. Popular rule has nowhere had a sporting chance to vindicate the solid claims of democracy. It is victimized by friends and foes. The friends of democratic government have been betrayed by their own hopes, because, trusting in unimaginative righteousness, they would not use the techniques and the controls which are required if democratic faith becomes a reality in the institutions and the life of the nation. The foes of democracy are quite sure that the unorganized and chaotic interests of many groups in the national society will prove their best allies against a sane and reasonable national economy and culture. It is a bitter commentary on the world crisis of which the United States is a necessary part that the needs of men for cooperation and security have become the

cruelest divisive weapons both among nations and within the nation among its own citizens.

The crisis in democratic government and in democratic society has come at a time when scientific invention has swiftly changed the ways of living and the ways of work for all men. The greatest contribution of modern industry to the twentieth century has been war, disease, and unemployment. These products of industrialism have almost destroyed the hope of peace among nations and have thrown up within nations large groups of embattled and dispossessed citizens. The crisis of democracy is threefold: incompetent and unplanned government, economic insecurity, and spiritual dispossession in citizenship.

The challenge to the South to create a civilization in which there is essential democracy for white and black is one of the most difficult problems a dominant race has ever had put to its leadership and to its institutions. It is all the more a crucial test of the South's capacity for self-control and self-direction because the whole spirit and form of democracy are under indictment throughout the world. But unless the South is willing to have its ways of life and its institutions constantly threatened by sniping from outsiders and to see its community life degraded and despoiled by race passion and prejudice, the South must resolutely build a civilization in which two races work in intelligent cooperation.

The challenge of citizenship in the South is the challenge of a cooperative citizenship. The aims of this

cooperative citizenship must be as broad as the economic and educational and cultural needs of the white and black citizens of the South. There can be no security for the white people of the South until the Negro is a responsible citizen. The Negro's acceptance of his part in building a civilization of sanity and security will prove one of the landmarks in the history of civilization. It is the great privilege of the South to work out under conditions of liberty and justice and good will the necessary experiment of a biracial civilization. The South cannot remain half slave and half free economically, nor can serfdom be the lot of the peasant black and independence the luck of the white. If the South is ever to be a dominant region in art and literature and education and business, the destiny of the white and the Negro must be one in establishing a cooperative citizenship in a biracial civilization.

The challenge of civic training is to give direction to the amazing energies of popular education and to establish the intent of government and business and public institutions, that a quality civilization can be securely maintained where two races live and work. The enemy of the South has been drift in race relations. And the drift has been exploited by the worst elements in Southern industry, Southern politics, and Southern religion, with the calamitous result that even men of good will and reason have accepted this passive attitude in race relations in the South. If this philosophy dominates, there is no hope for a great future

in our biracial civilization; for drift is the vicious force which destroys all purposes creating a good society.

Civic training in a biracial civilization must directly oppose the cowardly cant of the philosophy of drift; and with this opposition must go an alert and inspired faith in the rule of law and reason in race relations. The future of the mighty area from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, with its heritage of ideals and its belief in a way of life, is inevitably joined with the working out of justice for two peoples. The one now dominant in political power and prestige must not be penalized in its strength by the sentimentalist who sees some magic in color, nor must this great people take its lessons in race adjustment from the long-distance voice of financial philanthropy in New York. But if the white race is not to be penalized in its strength, how much more impelling is the warning that the weakness and the present disabilities of the Negro not be prostituted to build a false and specious security for the white race, which in itself will curse the strength and defy the cunning of the race if Southern civilization is not built by cooperative citizenship.

Civic training in all the complex and interdependent relations of modern community life is an absolute necessity if there is to be any consciousness of responsibility on the part of the citizen. No government and no order of society can long endure which neglects the duty of winning the loyalty of its citizens. There is nothing sacred or divine about governments. They

exist to promote security and happiness, and they last so long as they serve these purposes. It is then all the more an insistent challenge of civic training in an age of quick transportation and communication, when all the old patterns of social cohesion are loosened, that the services and institutions of democratic government command the active support of citizens. They not only must know their freedom, but they must value that freedom because it gives a larger security in work and a greater happiness in living.

The problem of creating a sense of responsibility among the citizens of a biracial civilization is a double one, and should be put in the first place by leaders of opinion and by the public school system. The loyalty of the white race must be gained by insuring a constantly higher level of participation in the whole life of the community by citizens, and for both white and Negro there must be no artificial handicaps put before ability and character. What is thus seen as an ideal is a new way of looking at the state. But it is a very practical ideal, for the existence of the state depends upon the loyalty of its citizens who believe that the aims of the state include their welfare and happiness. Civic training in a biracial civilization must help to create the conditions of security and respect and participation in the community life for all citizens.

There are invisible barriers in our civilization in the South which are more destructive of the good life of the community than any of the recognized Jim Crow laws. The Jim Crowism of the spirit is a more devas-

tating curse, because it divides the best in both races from a common acceptance of responsibility and leaves to the least prepared in spirit the task of adjustment. The adjustment in business, in government, in all the affairs of the community is on the level of ignorance or stupidity or prejudice when it is impossible for reason to point to a way of generous action for both races. A great opportunity of good will is also a necessary challenge to common action for a quality standard in our biracial civilization.

The invisible barriers between white and black are to be raised only when common responsibilities are accepted by both races. Here is the duty of leadership. Upon enlightened civic and educational leaders falls the duty of lifting the tragic silences and taboos which now obtain in relationships between white and black. Shall we remain victims of suicide and allow contemporary dullness and brutality to set the standards of a life we share in common? If America of today cannot maintain an alertly intelligent attitude of race cooperation, the twentieth century is doomed to confirm, and even sanctify, the prejudices of a nation in its soul half free and half slave. And if the forces of freedom in America are not dominant in race relationships, the mastery of American life will be given to leaders in whose minds lurk the fears and shadows of a narrow national culture. The only destiny of real freedom in America for any of us is when the power within each race is released to give security to us all in life and in pursuit of happiness.

The human appeal of hunger and dispossession is powerful today. So a critical temper is insistent that the values of life and personality be considered first in a controlled national economy. Here the constructive leader of opinion and administrative action can affirm the essential democracy of economic justice for the Negro. If there is to be any tolerable future in which there is economic security for the worker in this nation, it is a future in which there is no color line. Decent wages, standard of living, and housing, rights of organization, and full protection by the law and public opinion—these are objectives which cannot be held for the white worker and denied the Negro.

Citizenship training as it affects the economic life of a biracial civilization will certainly not overlook the special aptitudes of groups within each race; but any arbitrary or artificial barriers set before the Negro will be a crueler injustice to the dominant white race. This is true because the fight for justice and for bread and shelter is the struggle which the individual worker shares with all workers. A degraded Negro agricultural peasantry means a degraded white agricultural peasantry. A low technical standard of training for the Negro mechanic retards the whole progress of industry. The application of labor laws to one race and not to the other inevitably means that effective social legislation and adequate labor administration are impossible social objectives.

The greedy hand of mammon has almost destroyed civilization, and has made a land ugly in its industrial

enterprises through the waste and human degradation of unemployment. And the fierce lust of industrialists who would make profits from childhood and womanhood and all defenceless workers, this awful modern giant of an unplanned industrialism, cares nothing for the color line. These dollars are not labeled "white" or "black." The profit motive may be piously paraded in racial prejudice because by such means a whole civilization may be put in slavery to greed.

There is a common fight for economic security in democracy which must be made by all men of good will. Economic security for every citizen is the very foundation of the state's claim in democracy today for the loyalty and allegiance of its citizens. Therefore, more and more attention must be put upon the training of citizens to know how to protect their economic interests. Education for citizenship in democracy today means that the objective of economic freedom be given first place in the teaching of those who are worthy to instruct democracy and to direct the working of the institutions of democratic peoples.

THE NEW DEAL: AN ESTIMATE IN 1934

I

THE New Deal is a direct result of America's coming of age industrially. The background of the New Deal is the continuing industrial revolution caused by the rapid growth of communication and transportation and the greatly increased mechanical efficiency of the chief agencies of production in modern civilization. The economic background is plainly seen in the conflict between a program of planned national economy and the fatalistic philosophy of *laissez faire*. The end of *laissez faire* was the beginning of the New Deal.

The political background of the New Deal is significant. The tremendous strain upon monetary policies and the industrial system of every country has caused the postwar years to be a period when the whole theory and practice of democracy have been questioned. The aftermath of war was marked by fluctuating currencies, dislocated trade, unplanned budgets. Unemployment became the major problem of every government in power. The United States seemed for a while to be isolated from the common ills of the postwar world. But in 1929 the full impact of a bankrupt world was felt upon domestic policy. It became apparent that the three previous administra-

tions to President Roosevelt—Harding, Coolidge and Hoover—had failed to understand the awful crisis of a dismayed world in revolt. The economic wasteland of three national administrations provides a background for the necessity of a New Deal. There would have been a New Deal following these three administrations no matter who was elected President of the United States; but the fortunate fact is that President Roosevelt could give imagination and courage and direction to a philosophy of the New Deal. He came upon an American scene that was ripe for change. His eyes saw a demoralized people and the crumbling structure of American banking and business and agricultural life. He acted. The New Deal has thus become Roosevelt in action. The New Deal is yet to become an awakened nation in action.

It is well to describe the national scene in the words of President Roosevelt himself who has assumed the responsibility of the New Deal. He, it is said, is more popular than the machinery by which the New Deal is functioning, and if this be true, it is all the more important to understand the temper of the man who in his inaugural address warned Congress that in the event Congress shall fail to act and in the event that the national emergency is still critical he would not evade the clear course of duty that would then confront him. He plainly said: "I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis—broad executive power to wage a war against the emergency as great as the power that would be given to me if

we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe." His statement was really based upon the platform of the Democratic Convention at Chicago in 1932 which declared: "The only hope for improving present conditions, restoring employment, affording permanent relief to the people, and bringing the nation back to the proud position of domestic happiness and of financial, industrial, agricultural and commercial leadership in the world lies in a drastic change in economic governmental policies." This is a mandate from the party and by its performance will the Democratic party be tested.

It is no wonder that the President could say: "Values have shrunken to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currents of trade; the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone."

President Roosevelt in his inaugural address demanded that "the Temple of our civilization be restored to the ancient truths." But he saw these ancient truths in the twentieth-century America to which he had dedicated himself in making possible a new deal. He could thus affirm:

"This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today.

"A host of unemployed citizens face the grim prob-

lem of existence, and an equally great number toil with little return. Only a foolish optimist can deny the dark realities of the moment.

"Yet our distress comes from no failure of substance. We are stricken by no plague of locusts. Compared with the perils which our forefathers conquered because they believed and were not afraid, we have still much to be thankful for. Nature still offers her bounty and human efforts have multiplied it. Plenty is at our doorstep, but a generous use of it languishes in the very sight of the supply.

"The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more noble than mere monetary profit."

It is essential to state in plain terms that the philosophy of the New Deal is meaningless unless it can be translated into a standard of living and security for the people, and it must become the cornerstone upon which the institutions of economic and social and cultural welfare of approximately 120,000,000 people are based. It is commonplace to remark that as the depression deepened in the United States, the monetary purchasing power for the mass products of industry was further and further curtailed. Professor Paul H. Douglas, who now heads the Consumers Division of the NRA, declared that so far had this process gone that in March, 1933, there were no fewer than 4,500,000 families or between 18,000,000 and 20,000,000 people who derived virtually their sole support from relief. This relief amounted on the average to only approxi-

mately $20 per month per family or a little less than $5 per month per person or to from 15 to 16 cents a day per person. This was really not enough for food alone, while it left nothing with which to buy clothing, fuel, shelter and incidentals.

At the same time the purchasing power of the farmers was only a little higher than this, since the average net cash income in 1932 of the six million farm families was slightly less than $250 a year or somewhat below $5 per week per family. This amounted to less than $1 a week or around 13 to 14 cents a day for the approximately 30,000,000 people in the countryside. There were thus at least 45,000,000 people (eliminating duplications) or one-third of our entire population whose purchasing power had been almost wiped out.

II

The New Deal is necessarily a changing experiment in policy-making and in administration. President Roosevelt has certainly not been unmindful of the importance of his executive authority under the National Recovery Act. He knows and the country knows that the immediate economic future of the country depends upon the administration of the various acts and agencies under the National Recovery Act. President Roosevelt reminded the country in his statement outlining his program under the NRA that in his inaugural he laid down the simple proposition that nobody is going to starve in this country. He enlarged upon this in his latter statement, saying: "It

seems to me to be equally plain that no business which depends for existence on paying less than living wages to its workers has any right to continue in this country. By 'business' I mean the whole of commerce as well as the whole of industry; by workers I mean all workers —the white-collar class as well as the men in overalls; and by living wages I mean more than a bare subsistence level—I mean the wages of decent living." Was he too optimistic when he believed that the NRA would inaugurate an industrial covenant in this country between Capitalism and Labor? His hope was expressed in this language: "Throughout industry, the change from starvation wages and starvation employment to living wages and sustained employment can, in large part, be made by an industrial covenant to which all employers shall subscribe. It is greatly to their interest to do this because decent living, widely spread among our 125,000,000 people, eventually means the opening up to industry of the richest market which the world has ever known. It is the only way to utilize the so-called excess capacity of our industrial plants. This is the principle that makes this one of the most important laws that ever came from Congress, because, before the passage of this act, no such industrial covenant was possible."

The New Deal of President Roosevelt's administration marked the end of the old order of unenlightened individualism and unimaginative capitalism in this country. It is well that this fact be said again and again. What is more important though is to ask

whether there is in this experiment a design for government which will begin a new social and economic order. None has stated better the case against the haphazard theory of government than Mr. Tugwell, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. He has declared that "Government, or any part of it, is not in itself something; it is for something. It must do what we expect of it or it must be changed so that it will." He has plainly revealed the shallow argument of those who talk about the constitutionality of the national recovery program and who would drag back into discussion the doctrines of "free competition" and "governmental interference." The Constitution, he has written, "is used as a holy of holies within which the ugly practices of free competition can be hid from vulgar eyes."

It is of great concern to know if in the indictment of the past for waste and inefficiency and for an unplanned society, which has nearly wrecked the American nation, there is also energy enough through the New Deal to build a planned society. Mr. Tugwell has stated that "only a socialized industry can market its goods continuously because, until it is socialized, it can not join in the protection of demand." He knows there is no invisible hand in government and no one has said this more aptly than he: "The jig is up. The cat is out of the bag. There is no invisible hand. There never was. If the depression has not taught us that, we are incapable of education. Time was when the anarchy of the competitive struggle was not too costly. Today it is

tragically wasteful. It leads to disaster. We must now supply a real and visible guiding hand to do the task which that mystical, non-existent invisible agency was supposed to perform, but never did." Can the power of the New Deal supply this real and visible guiding hand?

However adventurous the program of the New Deal may be and however exhilarating it must be to rediscover the Constitution which is interpreting the terms of the New Deal, and "recapturing the vision of a government equipped to fight and overcome the forces of economic disintegration," the fact remains that the success of the program of the New Deal finally depends upon the administration of the New Deal. It is thus a dangerous doctrine to join Roosevelt, the administrator of the New Deal, the Democratic party, the agency of the New Deal, and the American people, the consumers of the New Deal, so closely that they cannot be separated.

The New Deal has dramatically and drastically entered the field of national finance and banking, agriculture, public relief, and unemployment. Through the RFC and the TVA the government has inaugurated a policy of financial control and social planning. Will it be possible for the Government after the immediate aims of reviving industry and trade and raising the purchasing power of the masses have been attained to remove its powerful hands from the machinery of control that the New Deal has inaugurated? Has the government of the United States capacity enough to

guide national social planning? Is business willing to take a place of second importance in the management of industrial affairs? Will labor and industrialists co-operate? And, finally, is there an awakened opinion in this country which will support the social ideals of the New Deal?

The New Deal is creating very definite problems in social legislation and social planning. It has been reported by engineers that a restoration of the productive level of 1929 will only re-employ about 50 per cent of those now unemployed. Relations of labor and employers, the direct shaping of national policy between government and business, are questions which will command continuing attention of the administration.

The organization of the economic life of the nation is certainly implicit in the New Deal. It is then important that a continuous current of fresh ideas be turned upon the operation of the New Deal and the agencies which are established to carry out the program of national recovery. When national health is strengthened there must more and more be the insistent demand of the critical temper upon the working of the NRA. So far it is apparent that popular support has been emotional and often self-seeking. The impressive popularity of the President has dimmed at times the vision of the people. There has not been sufficient instruction of the people in the real purpose of national recovery. Mass opinion has been put behind the adventurous program of the Roosevelt administration.

The necessary educational program of informing the nation of what they can expect in their institutions if the NRA is successful has not yet been adequately suggested.

The greatest service the friends of national recovery can render today is to keep in mind clearly the essential aims of national security and to emphasize the necessity for a new economic and social system in this country. It is certainly true that the NRA has created a tremendous interest in social and economic problems. This interest must be organized and be given full and complete expression throughout the country.

It is obvious that a revolutionary scheme of national recovery undertaken in a period of widespread unemployment which has billions to dispense offers opportunities for waste and misuse. The vast sums which have been spent have certainly not always been carefully expended. Official stupidity has often triumphed. Telegrams have been the last retreat of impotent bureaucrats. The simple fact is that the administration of these funds has to be in the hands of many people who have a great diversity of financial and political interests to serve. To set up overnight relief agencies has resulted in abuse. But what is more serious is the useless work that has been done. A large number of unimaginative leaders have been put in charge of the various activities under the recovery acts. The hack politician and the old party war horses have often been the responsible directors of policy. In far too many instances men are in control of the machinery of re-

covery who are not in sympathy with the aims behind President Roosevelt's program. If there is to be any vital and permanent direction of a new civilization out of the New Deal, the large body of local, district, state, and national leaders must be a different type, not pensioners of party privileges under the auspices of national recovery.

What is more significant of the New Deal is the unpreparedness of the nation for the changes which it makes inevitable. It is essential that a determined effort be made to raise the level of public opinion on the value and the purposes of the New Deal. There is no strategy which can equal intelligent understanding of what President Roosevelt has in mind. He has asked public confidence and he has risked its perils. The wisdom of party and patriotism should be to command voluntary allegiance to a crusade of ideas in government.

The ideals of social justice behind the philosophy of the New Deal are not temporary standards for an emergency period. The passion and plan of a saner and more just economic system are implicit in the organized effort to feed and clothe and give work to American citizens. But these ideals are necessarily to be embodied in law and are to be defined in American business and in the institutions of American life—the schools, the press, the churches. There can be no turning back in safety, because the citizens of this country have seen what a government can do when that government is determined no citizen shall starve. The little tight words of fear ought not to be heard now.

This nation cannot take its social policy from Bourbons outraged because their ancient right to rule or ruin mankind is repudiated. Nor can the American people be content with a public relief theory of democratic society. There is no future for democracy when its farmers are grasping peasants, its workers in cities snatched from bread lines to be transferred to relief rolls, and when its economic system is just willing to pay the subsistence costs of its existence. The worst cowardice of finance and business is the profit-seeking motive. They seem to be helpless before either a constructive view of industry or a creative attitude of the necessary tasks of community life. They want jobs in Washington primarily to guard their own particular interests. Not only do they interpret national policy but they seek to guide the special interests of privileged groups for whom they are the paid—and expensively paid—spokesmen.

The costs of prosperity have been great in this country, and the prolonged depression is just one of the burdens which a great people have had to endure. The insolence of so-called big business should never be tolerated by a people who have seen its most blessed ornaments escape from income tax to palatial yachts and foreign castles. A government that has poured billions into bankrupt railways and defaulting banks and has seen these rugged individualists come lustfully for bounties of government funds: this government of an adventurous people should not be too proud to use all its resources to help its citizens build a civilization

worth living in. Government has too long listened to the self-deluding pious phrases of bankers, electric power magnates, and all exploiters of a magnificently endowed continent who have put greed of profits before faith in the destiny of the American people. Now the only destiny of American government is with a people who are determined to create a new kind of civilization in which there is security for all in work and in community and national life.

A new crusade for a quality civilization in the United States is the greatest thing that can come out of the New Deal. Education in democratic experiment must be given the first place. The chief concern is how people live and work and what they do with their life. The alert leaders of American thought and culture must wisely and boldly give direction to an awakened people who through the New Deal will pioneer a nation to a New Day.

THE LOGIC OF CAPITALISM

THE recent writings of Professor Laski bear plainly the mark of the present crisis in society. The vast scale of world upheaval since 1914 is reason enough for his purpose in the present study to discover the nature of the modern state. He divides *The State in Theory and in Practice* into four parts: The Philosophic Conception of the State, State and Government in the Real World, The State and the International Community, and The Outlook for Our Generation. Mr. Laski suggests that this book is a sequel to his *Democracy in Crisis,* published in 1933, and the philosophic implications of that brilliantly persuasive study are now developed further. By looking steadily and with profound insight he has achieved his professed aim: "To discover the nature of the modern state . . . to explain that nature by an examination of its characteristics as these have been revealed by its history; and, in their light, it seeks to outline a theory of the state more in consonance with that history than the classic outlook." He is not pleasantly optimistic about chaos. What is important, he looks at the abyss and utters only the words worth saying: "reason" and "courage." If these are translated into action he adds "hope."

This study is written in the sharp straight-pointed

style of *Democracy in Crisis*. He has in this volume reduced his political theory to direct statement, perhaps with more directness than in any of his previous writing—for example, in the didactic sentences on society, state, sovereignty, equality, and class relations. He is able to do this because his thesis is always out in the open, and he will not allow the reader to wander into bypaths. By state he means "a society . . . which is integrated by possessing a coercive authority legally supreme over any individual or group which is part of the society." His concern is with the intent of the state, and he sees this intent in the history of the state always and inevitably the same. What the state has always done is to put the coercive authority at the disposal of the class which, in any given society, owns the instruments of production. "In a capitalist society, the state maintains the law and order necessary to preserve capitalist principles. In a society like that of Soviet Russia, where the instruments of production are owned in common, the law and order of the Soviet state will be used to enforce the distributive consequences of such common ownership. The state, that is to say, is always at the disposal of that class in the community in which is vested the legal title to the ownership of those interests. The law it makes will be law for their interest."

Not since Marx has there been as incisive probing into the economic basis of class relations. These relations are seen in the world setting of capitalism and democracy, fascism and capitalism, democracy and dic-

tatorship. For many there may be unhappy mental disturbance in facing Laski's realistic statement that "whether implicit or explicit, the ultimate purpose of the class struggle can be realized only by the conquest of the state." The argument is simply that there is no other way the coercive power of the state can be used to effect a decisive change in property relationships. Thus in a society where the instruments of production are privately owned "the main fact of significance is the struggle for the possession of the state-power between the class which owns those instruments and that which is denied access to the benefits of that ownership." The conflict of class interests in a capitalist society is taken for granted, because capitalism implies a special system of class relations, and the coercive power of the state is used to maintain these class relations. These relations have, Professor Laski points out, never been challenged in the system of Fascism either by Hitler in Germany or by Mussolini in Italy.

Laski asks whether the transition from capitalism to socialism, with all the changes in class relationships that it implies, can be accomplished peacefully in a democratic community. His argument of course is always implicit that the assumptions of capitalism contradict the implications of democracy. The institutions of democracy and the processes of democracy are only judged valid, and are only tolerated in a capitalist society, so long as they do not so function as to destroy "the essential implications of capitalism, that is, the class relations which the private owner-

ship of the means of production involves." Professor Laski argues that when political democracy seeks to transfer ownership of the means of production to the community, the capitalist class will, if it can, use the coercive power of the state to suppress democratic institutions. He cites Italy, Germany, and Austria to prove that the maintenance of political democracy is not an inherent purpose of the state as such. In fact political democracy as a form of government is able to maintain itself only so long as it does not contradict the implicit needs of the class relations a capitalist system requires.

Is it peaceful change or revolution? Historically, Laski argues, the important changes that have been made peacefully have always been made by an expanding economic system. Economic privilege does not suffer erosion in such a period, but only in periods of economic contraction where the demands of the masses cannot be conceded without a revolution in the class relations of the existing society. Again and again, as in his *Democracy in Crisis,* Professor Laski repeats what to him is both history and a challenge to the present "religion of ownership": "Men may abdicate positions they do not deem fundamental. So far in history, at any rate, they have not abdicated peacefully, as a class, from any position they deemed vital to their well-being." The references to the House of Lords, the history of the judicial decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, his brilliant comments upon Professor Gregory's denial that the rise of Fascism is no

proof of the breakdown of the capitalist system, all are used to illustrate the basic argument of the coercive power of the state being used to protect existing class relations. The references to the New Deal and the constitutionality of the Roosevelt recovery legislation, like all his comments on the United States, are illuminating. Especially apt is the statement, in discussing the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, that for all their attempt to be law rather than politics, the decisions "illustrate the inevitability that constitutional law must be subordinated in a capitalist society to the needs of capitalism."

Professor Laski in the beginning of his study suggested that theoretically there is no reason why society ("a group of human beings living together and working together for the satisfaction of their mutual wants"), now divided into conflicting national societies, should not be equivalent to the totality of human beings. And in a superb way he shows that in the international sphere, as in the national sphere, the state's essential nature is to maintain some given system of class relations. In the same way and for the same reasons that democracy and capitalism cannot endure together, capitalism and an effective international order are incompatible. International capitalism and war are one. Vested interests arise inherently from the class relations of a capitalist society, and the forces which protect them internationally are the same which dominate in the present pattern of national economic life. The struggles behind the scenes at Geneva fit into this

interpretation: "Exactly as the sovereign state protects, in the internal sphere, a system of legal rights intended to safeguard his (the capitalist's) supremacy, so externally, its authority, by the sheer logic of his relationships with it, must be used to impose that supremacy, so far as may be, upon others. It is only as these class relations are transformed that state antagonisms become capable of any fundamental reconciliation. Upon the existing basis, the utmost good-will in international relations can only postpone, without being able to avoid, the ultimately inevitable conflict." The policies to which Japan and Hitler and Mussolini are driven by their internal position, the naval and armaments races, the blind, yet hurrying, growth of economic nationalism in Great Britain and the United States under the present national and international economic system, inevitably mean war. Such policies, Professor Laski suggests, put a strain upon the peace-system impossible to dissipate while class relations remain what they are. Such is the logic of capitalism.

THE LEGISLATIVE WAY

LEGISLATION AND SOCIAL ECONOMIC PLANNING

I

THE critical temper of social thought in the United States in the fourth year of unemployment is an accepted fact. The continued loss of world trade and the strain upon the financial structure of this nation have given to international relations a practical interest that in many quarters even rivals concern over domestic issues. In fact, sensible business men make little attempt to separate the two large areas of commercial and financial exploitation, the one representing the home market and the other concerned with promoting business or sustaining it in the foreign market. There has been a common ground in the prolonged crisis of unemployment. A national campaign each year is now taken for granted, and there is no national organization which has not been called upon to attack the nationwide task of supplying work for the unemployed.

To provide employment is now an accepted duty of government. It is significant that the world crisis has brought closer to the people of the United States the breakdown of their own social and industrial system. This has been made plain in the efforts of the

national government to promote international peace, and it is evident in the administrative measures of President Roosevelt with regard to trade and finance and unemployment. The failure of what amounts to war-time measures to revive a decrepit national financial and industrial economy should be studied by every informed person who has any faith at all in the experiment of democracy. The ways to fresher thinking may appear.

This is especially true with regard to the widespread interest in protective measures of social legislation, which is centered mainly upon the effects of unemployment in industrial America. The opportunity to plan constructively on such a scale as is now possible may not come again. The human appeal behind legislation will not be so powerful again in this generation. The nation will either forget or become callous. While the critical temper is not so insistent as it needs to be to affect the cautious and cowardly leadership which evades the facts of economic waste in the national depression, nevertheless it may provide stimulus for a larger program of collective action than would be possible if this popular feeling were altogether absent. This popular reaction against what has become known classically as "rugged individualism" should not be underestimated. It is not deeply grounded in an awakened social conscience which would demand a new economic order, but leaders who know what is needed can certainly inform and guide by their instruction, and make possible sub-

stantial gains in national legislation and community organization.

It is worth noting that during 1933 and 1934 there will be no lack of information before Congress and the state legislatures concerning the costs of the depression, not only in terms of the degradation of the life of the unemployed and the workers, but, as informed students know now, in terms also of the terrible damage done by a lowered standard of living to health and education, to individual and family and community life. Fortunately, not only have the unemployed found their spokesmen, to whom the country is listening, but this first year of power for the Democratic party, with the promise of a New Deal, gives an opportunity for all groups to take their claims before their governments, city and state and national. The powerful lobby of the American Legion has strongly presented the effects of the depression on this important group. Nor are the farmers to go unheard, if for no other reason than that politicians will use them to hear their own echoes.

The official period for "muddling through" the depression ended with the November elections in 1932. For practical purposes its end was authoritatively announced by Secretary of Commerce Lamont when on March 20, 1931, his special census report revealed that on January 1, 1931, there were 6,050,000 citizens out of work. The winter campaign was recognized when President Hoover appointed Mr. Gifford to head the national committee "to cooperate with

public authorities and reenforce national, state and local agencies which will have responsibilities for the relief activities." Official optimism was never less impressive than in the figures for federal expenditures from the beginning of the depression in 1929 down to the first half of 1932. According to the statement of the President's Organization on Unemployment Relief, federal construction, maintenance, and drouth relief expenditures for the calendar years 1930 and 1931, and to June, 1932, were as follows: 1930, $452,301,000; 1931, $787,587,000; 1932 (six months), $373,593,000. Of the total for 1931, $47,000,000 constituted the amount loaned to farmers in the drouth areas. Thus, from the beginning of the depression in 1929 to June, 1932, more than $1,500,000,000 were spent. Since that time national, state and local governments have embarked on programs of direct relief amounting to billions of dollars. The importance of this expenditure, without any defined social policy behind the appropriation, will not be overlooked in the general problem of national social planning. So much has been attempted without any program. What could be accomplished by intelligent administration for the future?

All this means that the years 1931–1932 definitely marked the beginning of a new period in the history of American social legislation. The years before President Hoover's administrative efforts in the second and third years of the national crisis of unemployment, 1931 and 1932, are entirely distinct from the period

since that time with respect to the legislative record of state and federal governments in passing protective measures to safeguard and maintain a standard of life for the American people. A new social policy with regard to legislation was demanded in 1931 and 1932, if the well-being of the people had any practical meaning at all. The national crisis of unemployment and the destitution of millions required municipal, state, and federal aid in the form of direct grants from tax funds for relief. Since 1929 the standard of living of the American people has been seriously threatened by unemployment, and by nationwide industrial and agricultural depression combined with worldwide financial dislocation and bankruptcy. Social legislation as an organized and collective effort by state action to prevent industrial waste and human degradation has assumed an entirely new significance in these years because it has become a practical question of security for American citizens. The results are primarily to be recorded in measures taken to meet the crisis of unemployment by municipal, state, and federal governments, but they are also indicated in the wider acceptance of the principle of old-age pensions, and the insistence that the industrial system shall more adequately protect the child and woman worker from exploitation. The *laissez-faire laissez-aller* period of social legislation in the United States has ended. It was not simply a matter of governmental action last year in a time of emergency, and it is certainly not just that now, because everywhere there

is conviction that the present crisis marks a breakdown in the capitalist system. Few deny the truth in the words of Sir Arthur Salter read at the World Social Economic Congress at Amsterdam in August, 1931, when he said: "We have learnt at last that unqualified *laissez-faire laissez-aller* involves intolerable waste and intolerable injustice."

The American mind is today impressed with the intolerable waste of muddling through, more strongly perhaps than with the intolerable injustice of an unregulated industrial system. The major industrialists have with great astonishment to themselves come upon the principle of waste in this depression. They have come upon this fact somewhat in the same way in which they have piously accepted the necessity of world peace. The diminution in the profits of enterprise has been a fairly accurate measure of the industrialists' realization of the intolerable waste of the depression. In this regard their instruction will no doubt continue. But far more significant is the necessity that the beginning which has been made in a new social policy with regard to legislation affecting standards of living should be directed with great energy. The crucial moment in legislation and planning is here, and if lost by delay will not return for a generation. This present awakening of interest must see to it that social legislation becomes an integral part of the national social planning for well-being and security for the future American. The development of these tendencies can be defined in acts of Congress

and by the states. The administrative and constitutional principles involved will be accepted by a convinced people. Senator Borah in his address on the LaFollette-Costigan Bill gave urgency as well as respectability to an intelligent constitutional morality when he described the flag that floats above a hungry people as a "dirty rag" polluting the very air in which it flies. This is a charter of freedom for action.

The believer in a vigorous, even daring, period of social planning on a national scale may plainly join the issues of this present time to the whole past development of American life. National problems have defined national policies. The years before 1931 may well be considered a period of humanitarian struggle in the history of American protective legislation, characterized by years of slow and unexciting progress in the effort to control by governmental enactment an undirected industrial system which had neither a conscience nor a determined will to organize its interests in terms of social justice. The classic method followed in 1776 and 1861 and at every turning point of American history has again suggested the strategy of these times. Four years of unemployment are sufficient to mark it as a problem of dominant national importance. But the evils of unregulated industrial life go far beyond unemployment. While the national Congress was divided upon empty formulas of relief, breadlines have written a new American political theory and have broken down resistance on arid theoretical grounds. Hungry people vote and

their friends vote. Thus, the era of 1929–1933 sees the emergence of a new period of social and economic policy in which hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated by municipal, state, and national governments are being spent for direct relief. Also, in times of peace a constitutional revolution is taking place in the policy of administration of national funds, and the commonplace of a national crisis is not sufficient to explain away the fact that a technique used in an emergency could be utilized far more effectively in directing a planned national economy. We are not so dull a people as not to learn from what is going on in Washington that government is not a holy thing, but a jumble of constitutional phrases which hide an antiquated social creed and conceal the unimaginative mind in the midst of great changes.

And here the political basis for the new constitutional morality is worth looking at. Millions of voting citizens are without work, and there is no security for them in the elemental matters of food and clothing and shelter. The margin of security for the white-collar worker and the great middle class, where they survive at all, has become desperately narrow, and this fact takes on a new political significance because it may quickly affect legislation. Millions of people in this country find now for the first time a new kind of freedom in their poverty; for they have learned they care not a thing for nineteenth-century platitudes, whether they are uttered by ex-President Hoover or President Roosevelt or Norman Thomas

or by hopelessly befuddled industrialists. What was remote in their social thinking has become as close as their children's future and their own life itself. They will eat, their children will be clothed, and the freedom which in their desperation they create will finally change their government. It is needs now, not just votes and platforms and platitudes. The effects will come sooner than many now are willing to admit.

It is important, then, that social legislation be considered as no longer an isolated plan of well-being for the worker. In the past, voluntary groups of economists, social-service workers, and competent students of national life have valiantly attempted to bring before labor leaders and legislatures and politicians of the so-called realist type the waste and wreckage of the bitterly competitive industrial system. The arena is now the whole of national life, not just a single state legislature. Alert minds everywhere in these forty-eight states have begun to study the officially admitted depression to find the means to inaugurate remedial social policies; and they have recognized the depression as a consequence of the unbalanced industrial economy of the United States and the world. The acceptance of this fact is the dividing line between the old world and the new. The passing of the pre-depression era of social legislation in the United States has been marked by months of debate and committee discussion in Congress about public relief and its administration. In the state legislatures there have been emergency bills for public relief, and in nearly

every legislature bills have been introduced which deal with unemployment, old-age pensions, and permanent schemes of organized welfare. Last year one reason for inaction was the plea that the emergency would soon be past. If it should end today the social effects would tax all agencies for several years to come. In 1933 and 1934 the falsity of this argument will be answered in state and national legislation.

It is great good fortune that in this country many determined students of American life had laid the basis for the study of social legislation before the present crisis. This background is necessary for an understanding of the very rapid progress which has been made in many legislatures since 1930 with regard to measures of relief and security. New York and Wisconsin, for instance, and other states as well, have had for years an honor roll of untiring men and women who saw how thin was the disguise of health and prosperity which had been worn too long by the industrial system of this country. These men and women knew that the social costs would later have to be paid. Informed critics of the waste of unemployment, students of the tragedy of unsecured old age, advocates of wider health and industrial protection for women and children, all these were better prepared for intelligent action in the crisis than the political leaders, who were slow to accept the obvious lessons of human misery and the breakdown of an uncontrolled and undirected economic system. Public opinion has moved faster than certain politicians be-

lieve is possible. But their votes in the various legislative bodies will soon record their realization of the change in political opinion. Legislation will follow. The late Senator T. H. Caraway with tears in his eyes described the plight of his own brother. Soon all constituents will share the limelight of senatorial sympathy.

There is no doubt that legislative action is to follow this prolonged period of industrial dislocation. This action should be nothing less than a real beginning for a saner and more just social order in this country. Men must not be allowed to perpetuate their discarded social philosophies and to continue the old grasping of profits simply because they may call this breakdown an "emergency" or a "depression" period. These years since 1929 have been a breathing space to give us a chance to build anew more wisely and humanely, and if intelligence fails to use the opportunity for action there is no other way out. This period should see the constantly expanding ideal of security reflected in statutes. Social legislation should become an integral part of national social planning in which the security of the whole people is the great unifying principle of action. There are more fundamental things that daring leadership can do, but at least in this field the great crisis gives a unique opportunity throughout the nation.

Future legislation should develop the present noteworthy tendencies of protection and responsibility through social control. Congress and each of the

forty-eight legislatures can become a part of the wider national program of social and economic planning. The federal system allows the wide use of compromise and experiment, and these need not fail the American people now. It is plain that the administrative and constitutional principles involved, and changes where they may be required, will be accepted by the convinced and determined democracy. This country gets its political philosophy from its needs, and for our politicians that is the only thing that matters. Now is the time to teach more pointedly that the purpose of economic organization is to be found in the degree to which it contributes to human well-being and happiness. Planned control can advance toward security for American citizens, and social legislation may well in these times help to build the foundations for a wider liberty and justice which have some meaning for men and women and children of the twentieth century.

Above everything else this nation should realize that it need not take its direction from leaders who have been repudiated and who have been in a large part responsible for the present crisis. Bankers should not prescribe what a future social policy should be under their so-called individualism, when they have been the first to profit under a planned administrative dictatorship in national finance. Politicians who have abdicated in this crisis have no public morality for the future which is worth talking about, and to the

fearful and unadventurous there is no prospect that a nobler America will claim their devotion. The words of M. Albert Thomas, late director of the International Labor Office, at the Amsterdam Congress referred to above, constitute a fine statement for those who are willing to make a beginning in social planning, knowing that the larger plans which will follow will rest securely upon foundations laid with sympathy and intelligence. Criticizing the view of those who maintain that social policy must give way before economic "natural laws," M. Thomas said:

> For my part I hold to the old tradition of those who for centuries have been reflecting on the ultimate groundwork of human society. The old philosophers of the eighteenth century were unanimous in saying that the end of society was the general happiness, and in the nineteenth century all those who found themselves face to face with the miseries of industrialism considered that the organization of society and industry should contribute to the general happiness, to the raising of the conditions of life and work. However Utopian or paradoxical such an attitude may appear, I maintain that the world will know no rest, no stability and no progress if we do not have the courage to declare, at a moment like this, that social policy must be safeguarded, that institutions must not be weakened. Otherwise the world is rushing straight to a catastrophic convulsion of society.

II

The world today is a confused world. This fact in itself would not have such tragic significance if it were not that civilization today is a complex inter-

dependent community of interests of men and nations and is based upon an entirely new foundation of science and technology.

Confusion is calamitous when it results in human misery and in the destruction of the social values of high standards of living. It is thus that the impact of modern technology has inevitably created a revolutionary world in science and in human relations. The world of the depression is a revolutionary world not only in science but in politics, and there is an insurgency among the peoples of the world which is reshaping the whole structure of modern political society.

At the crossroads of world depression in 1933 there is this new world that science and invention have made, characterized by speed, and its magic machine power has vastly changed the whole economic fabric of production and distribution. Men of necessity have accepted this world without understanding its power for good or evil in their lives. But at this crossroads of the century, from the other direction, comes the slow, bungling, muddling world of unorganized social and political relations.

These two worlds have in confusion blundered upon each other. Each world is an anarchy. The high-powered machine age of technology meets the ox-cart age of social science. The world of machinery undirected has gone as far as it can in safety, and has attained such power that now it is plain that technology is either to dominate the future direction of human so-

ciety blindly, or is to be controlled by and integrated with an equally strong and powerful organization of a new social and new economic order in the world. Decisions of destiny have to be made.

The world today is a confused world because it is plainly seen that there is enough of goods and commodities to satisfy the needs of men, and yet no system has been worked out by which these needs can be met in justice and equity. Material prosperity has been made possible by the elaborate exchange of goods throughout the world and by the rapid development in two centuries of the industrial revolution. The industrial revolution was blind in the beginning when it made a manure heap of the bodies of children and women and men in the growth of an unregulated factory system. The nineteenth century could in some way survive the injustice and blindness of the industrial revolution of that earlier period. But no one who has seen the terrible ravages of the industrial revolution of the twentieth century, with its accompanying phenomenon of a world-wide mad nationalistic policy of war, can believe that if the twentieth century fails to control the scientific and technological development of the century for the common good of all men and women, there is any sanity and any security for the peoples of the earth.

Science has been allowed to be an end in itself, and its little men, awed by the power which it brings to them, have thought of it as magic and not as one of the agencies to promote human welfare. It has be-

come an unknown god to universities, and they have crowded their laboratories with what in some instances is nothing but academic junk. They have not questioned the aims of the laboratory in terms of human values. No wonder, then, that now there is chaos. It is because unwisely in the past we have refused to understand the part science and invention can take in controlling social relationships and in guiding the destiny of the state.

What a bitter paradox it is that at the very time when the machine had been so perfected that hunger could be no more a menace, that housing could be made healthful, and that clothing could be made a thing of comfort and beauty, the blind pagan machine, instead of being controlled by man's will, was changed by man's stupidity into a godlike thing to worship. The machine age has become the very creator of poverty. It is the master, and rules over the undirected and unplanned age of electricity. Instead of creating a land of health and beauty and leisure, the world in its insane lust of greed has tried to harness the machine solely to gain profits, and human life has become a cheap thing. Revolution is the answer.

The world today is confused not only about the direction it should take for its safety, but even about its actual needs and how these needs may be met. Strangely enough, in a world that has the material foundation of prosperity for all and the technological equipment to satisfy all the basic needs of mankind, this modern society of engineers and financiers and

social scientists has tragically to accept the indictment of refusing to master its aims of living as it has controlled its expanding capacity to produce. The miracle of technology is the result of the manifold developments of electrical energy. Distance and time have been brought into the immediate service of science. But what has been achieved for the average man and woman in this new kind of world that the engineer and the financier and social scientist have made for us? Have human happiness and human aspiration had any adequate protection? The haunting cry of dispossession runs through the machine age. It is a dispossession of body and of spirit. The drift is toward disaster. If this drift is not stopped, the future of a complex industrial society is a future of anarchy and despair.

Men everywhere today are asking one question: "Is there a way forward out of the insecurity of the present?" The anxious and strained and desperate days of these times have compelled many to think not only of the present situation, with its overpowering depressions of spirit and vision, but in general of the tragedy of an unplanned society which has so cruelly mocked their hopes. Men challenge the present to make some contribution to an understanding of what they can do about the future. The recapture of citizenship in a world that can be controlled is the desperate necessity of the citizen of the twentieth century. This citizenship is not to be regained with confidence until there is clear understanding of the problems of

control and the conditions of mastery in our present complex civilization.

The indictment of the past is well-nigh universal now, but this indictment is as yet merely an indictment. It is simply the record of the reaction of men today to poverty and unemployment, a defiant rebellion because of the hunger and despair of workers. Does it mean there is as yet really a victory over the unorganized and unplanned world of yesterday? Does it mean conviction lies deep in men's minds that the way out is the way of deliberate planning for a new kind of world? The old world is not dead until men begin to build securely a new world. The past is not lifted from our hearts and from our imaginations until the ardor of a hardly gained faith valiantly sets itself to the task of using the institutions and agencies of these times for the rebuilding of the new world.

A new social and economic order is emerging from the postwar depression world. There is no stopping the inevitable changes which are taking place in the means of production, and there is no delaying, in safety, the transforming changes which discovery and invention are making in standards of living. The world will either be a more sane and a more secure and a more happy world, or it will relapse into a barbarism of economic and cultural conflict. The world is not a world in the image of yesterday, because yesterday is far removed from the actual technical and scientific bases of modern civilization. It is not pertinent to ask whether we want a new social and economic order.

It is rather a question of what we intend to do with the world which is with us. Shall drift destroy civilization? Or shall common sense and courage, by mastering the technological system and making it advance the aims of human welfare and happiness, be the answer to the confusion of the world of depression? Drift is suicide. Deliberate planning is the way to security.

The lawmaker and social scientist in the new social and economic order can give great enthusiasm to the service of intelligence. In the field of the social sciences the world of the future is to be a society in which individual and social intelligence will be far more powerful than in the past. There is no anarchy predetermined finally in social progress if there is the real builder's dream of a society based upon enduring principles of what may be achieved by adventurous social action.

There are two aspects of the function of the lawmaker and social scientist in the new social and economic order, and both should be seen in the pattern of the whole problem of modern democratic society. The essential objective of all honest men now is to aid in whatever way they can the steps toward recovery. Stark necessity is upon us. So near is the road back to low standards and intolerable injustice that it seems to open a means of escape even now to many who have given up any hope for better days. But the road back is no road at all, because all backward looking is merely accepting destruction as a way out.

The lawmaker, through a planned attack on existing anarchy in modern society, can help tremendously to give the claims of reason a larger acceptance in practical affairs. The default of reason in modern society lies largely in the acceptance of fact as fact in the physical world, yet the denial of the validity of fact as fact in social relationships. The importance of law and of the administration of law is in their contribution to a new kind of society. The lawmaker's larger duty in the new social order is to bring to the cruel woes of mankind the aid of the keen weapon of an intelligent understanding of a complex world, and to the unorganized life of a confused world the vision of reason accepting with enthusiasm the duty of leadership. This leadership in its trained and directed discipline can build a saner and more reasonable world.

III

President Roosevelt, through an administrative program which startled this nation and the world, has declared that the people of this nation have been impelled by events to join in a common struggle against economic chaos. He declared in his inaugural address: "We do not distrust the future of essential democracy. The people of the United States have not failed." He plainly warned Congress that if his recovery measures were delayed by the legislative branch of the government he would ask Congress for broad economic power to wage a war against the emergency as great as the power that would be given

to the president if the country were in fact invaded by a foreign foe. Four months of President Roosevelt's administration, from March to June, 1933, began a revolution in economic and constitutional experiment. The New Deal inaugurated a program of economic planning which was directly joined with the ideal of social control.

The significant fact in the measures of the first Roosevelt Congress was the repudiation of the economic and social order which made the depression inevitable. There was the fresh energy of revolution in action and the audacity of a new way of thinking about the state. But what is even more important than this is the fact that a tremendous effort has been made to reorganize and to direct the cooperative agencies of American industrial life. The government is attempting to combine all the power of collectivism with the energy of voluntary associations accepting a common responsibility with the government for the direction of industrial enterprise.

The intent of this vast revolutionary experiment in social planning is to reestablish in men's lives the sense of security and faith in their government. The enemy of democratic life has been a blind capitalism. Economic planning in itself is no contribution to the democratic life and democratic methods of control, for a completely routed *laissez-faire* capitalism may be attempting through such an organized effort, supported by vested interests and the government, to reestablish its prestige and authority. But economic

planning under the powerful discipline of ideals of social control may be the real beginning of a new deal for democratic life. The Roosevelt revolution may thus bring reality to the struggle for democratic control of government and business and life. Democracy has not only attempted short cuts, as President Lowell long ago suggested, but democracy has almost always been limited in its vision of a program of action, emphasizing the immediate and the transient goals of progress. Mr. Walter Lippmann in his Phi Beta Kappa address of 1932 at Columbia University, "The Scholar in a Troubled World," characterized the American democracy as "unsettled in its life and its convictions." He declared:

> For what is most wrong with the world is that the democracy, which at last is actually in power, is a creature of the immediate moment. Democracy of this kind cannot last long; it must, and inevitably it will, give way to some more settled social order. But in the meanwhile the scholar will defend himself against it. He will build himself a wall against chaos, and behind that wall, as in other bleak ages of the history of man, he will give his true allegiance not to the immediate world but to the invisible empire of reason.

However true such a characterization may be for the individual, it leaves out of account the effects of a chaotic policy of drift on society and on government. The individual scholar may take refuge where he may pitifully find a retreat, but for the nation there is no security which is not a security for all its people.

There is thus a tremendous moral value in reestablishing in these times a courageous faith in the future of essential democracy. It is here that legislation and social economic planning can make their greatest contribution to the way of democratic life in the United States. What does it matter that, as the *Magazine of Wall Street* said, "*Laissez-faire* and its concept of business as legalized private warfare are as dead as slavery was after Appomattox," if there is not a determined social policy to build securely the foundation of a good society? The National Industrial Recovery Act and all of the agencies and institutions established by governmental action under President Roosevelt must be completely dominated by ideals of social control and social ownership. There can be no greater tragedy of the depression years than to have the administrative and financial and governmental experiments of national recovery used to revive the outworn capitalist system. The depression is not worth its cost in social waste and human tragedy if the nation has not learned to use the machinery of social experiment to build a cooperative republic. The only allegiance worth asking for in the New Deal is the allegiance which courageously says its support is given only on condition that the national government shall accept the responsibility of creating a new social order.

The future is uncertain, yet men and nations know that the old order of economics and politics and the outworn institutional forms of the past are repudi-

ated. They will not be accepted in the planning of the future of America or the future of an interdependent world. After the depression, if there is any wisdom in the thought of the times, men will think less of the past and more of a future planned with hope and achieved in a confidence that by will and intelligence a better order of society is possible.

The present economic and political scene indicates that the capitalism which survives in the twentieth century will be a modified capitalism that accepts a social responsibility adequate to safeguard the American worker and to protect the American standard of living. This is a standard of living that includes health and leisure and recreation, and an educational system which trains children of all classes for modern living. If capitalism does not accept social responsibility it will quickly give way to dictatorship or to mob rule.

Prosperity will never again mean a return to the prewar capitalism which was uncontrolled and undirected, and which made inevitable the world's worst period of human misery and the world's worst period of economic dislocation. The future of industry and finance must be a deliberately planned future if there is to be any security for individuals or for nations.

If there is a way to a more just social order there will be a closer connection between economic practice and social morality. The profit system has proved its lack of motive power in a democratic society. It has also proved a failure in its futile effort to direct the growth of a modern industrial civilization. The

boasted efficiency of an undirected industrialism under capitalism has been answered by international bankruptcy in the postwar world, and by sixty millions of unemployed in 1933. This is fourteen years after the war, yet the wealthiest nation on earth has mobilized its governmental agencies to feed and clothe its people. The United States has had its millions unemployed through four winters. They are the answer to the philosophy of waste in an unplanned industrial society.

The great challenge to the American nation is to plan its future with a vision of what a democratic nation can do with its natural and human resources when they are all used to promote the aims of good living and to advance good will and justice among all men. No small or niggardly view of America's greatness is possible if there is wise planning for her industry and agriculture and social institutions in the twentieth century. The security of America will increasingly be joined with the security of all nations, and the machinery of keeping the peace of the world will command intelligent loyalty from the United States.

The insistent need of a world at peace will be of more importance, because to rebuild a strained domestic and world economy will require all the creative forces of politics and industry if there is to be any tolerable existence for a hundred and twenty millons of people. War will be the defeat of all hopes for a national destiny of liberty, and it will mean a world that accepts the final decisions of force.

Democracy must function in terms of the twentieth century. Man must control his future by social planning. A planned society is the only society that can meet the needs of industry and commercial life, and if America fails to build a cooperative economic system there is no way to recovery and security for the nation. In this world we live in—in the fourth decade of the twentieth century—the adventure of experiment must be found again in American life. Democracy must always be experimental and courageous. The depressions of business, the defeat of social ideals by war and poverty, can only be guarded against by an alert and experimenting people. The future of democracy rests with bold economic and social experiment.

The old world has passed away. Men are determined that a new world is to be, and that this new world will give a larger place to a justice and a good will and a security that can be translated into daily bread.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHILDHOOD TO LOUISIANA

THE American ideal of citizenship has always stood for three things: first, a standard of security; second, a standard of living; and third, a way of living. From colonial days and through the struggles of a pioneer agrarian civilization these great forces of American life were building the basis for the modern life of America. Each generation has interpreted these political and social and economic ideals in terms of its own needs. But there has been no diminution in the effort by individuals or by the state to make American citizenship mean security in making a life and making a living. The larger needs of childhood in each generation have first been seen by informed leaders and then slowly translated into a legal minimum of health and work and play and educational requirements. Childhood has had its day of growth and opportunity lengthened as lawmakers have seen the wisdom of creating in the children of today the foundations of the state of tomorrow.

It is well to see the spiritual significance of law and opinion discovering the child in all his manifest destiny in the society that is to be, which is always emerging from the past and the present; but the blind eyes of greed and pelf have only been opened by the forced rec-

ognition of the economic significance of childhood to the modern industrial state. The child's personality is a glorious hope, but only awakened social conscience has given protection to the child. And only social imagination has seen the challenge of childhood in terms of a saner and juster economic order.

The impact of modern industry upon American life gave a new meaning to the ideals of security and a standard of living and a way of life. Slowly the nation began to see its own human wealth degraded and exploited. The cheapest thing was human life. But soon the power that American ideals possessed in shaping laws and institutions began to be felt. The nation became conscious that its lasting security was in the welfare of its people and that its standard of living was a bulwark of national defence and that its way of life was the measure of its civilization.

Today in a crisis which is catastrophic in its effects on human life and institutions it is necessary again to define in terms of human needs the ideals of citizenship in American life. Foremost is the ideal of the child as a citizen in a new social and economic order. Not only is the child the active citizen of tomorrow, but the security of the child is a test at any time of the security of the state in which the child lives. A civilization which menaces childhood strikes at its own existence.

It is then of great concern in times of economic insecurity that childhood and its welfare be the dominant social program of an intelligent democratic society. The furtherance of the economic and social ideals of

American life is centered in an alert understanding of the child as the dynamic power which shapes the civilization of tomorrow. The government which neglects its youth destroys the strength which makes government function as an agency of reform and progress.

The growth in a social conscience with regard to the industrial system is seen in the story of the protection of children from the Health and Morals of Apprentices Act, 1802, in England, to the labor provisions affecting children in the National Recovery Act in the United States in 1933.

The laws of the twentieth century had their beginning in the Act of 1802, which was a response to the humanitarian impulse of that earlier time, in this instance connected especially with the epidemic in Manchester among the apprentices in the cotton mills. The Act of 1802 provided for the cleansing and ventilation of the cotton mills and factories, hours of labor, and the religious education of apprentices employed therein; and to compare its scant provisions with the laws protecting children in 1933 is to gain a fairly accurate impression of the contrast in the two centuries and in parliament's attitude toward the welfare of children. And when the child was given larger freedom in modern industrial society, a new freedom was given to the rights of workers.

Consider the situation in Louisiana. Elimination of child labor in this state made material progress during the decade between 1929 and 1930, the census figures disclose. Census records of 1920 showed that among

children between 10 and 15 years of age the percentage of boys working was 17.1, and of girls, 8.0. In the 10-year period between takings of the census these percentages were cut to 13.5 for boys and 6.6 for girls. Taking the figures for the 30-year period beginning in 1900, the decrease in the ratio of children of tender years working amounted to approximately two-thirds for both sexes. In 1930 there were 135,766 boys and 134,741 girls in this age group. Of these, 18,274 boys and 8,922 girls were working. Despite the gains of the decade, however, the Louisiana child labor percentages were still higher than the average for the United States. Percentage of boys in the United States working was 6.4 and of girls 2.9. Among children of 16 and 17 years of age in Louisiana the percentage with jobs was proportionately higher. There were 42,864 boys in this group, of which 22,524, or 52.5 per cent, were gainfully employed. Girls of the same ages numbered 44,760. Of these, 9,735, or 21.7 per cent, were working. National percentages were 41.2 and 22.1 for boys and girls respectively.

It is a remarkable commentary that what manufacturers said would bankrupt them has since March 4 under President Roosevelt become sound measures of economic recovery. For example, the president of the Louisiana Manufacturers Association declared before the Senate Capital and Labor Committee in Baton Rouge at the public hearing on the eight-hour day for women that "the passage of a bill limiting the work of women to eight hours a day and establishing a 48-hour

week will be burdensome to both industry and to the women. It will make it harder for Louisiana manufacturers to compete with the manufacturers in other states that are not under such a regulation. It will increase our production costs, and so give our competitors an advantage. Such an advantage will be reflected in smaller production and reduced employment. The law would be a hardship on the large class of working women who are paid by piecework. If they are allowed to work only eight hours a day instead of nine, their earnings will be correspondingly reduced. Furthermore, such a law would stop the half-day on Saturday, and make the women work through Saturday, as on every other week-day, in order to get in the 48 hours of the prescribed week. There is no need for a change. The present law has been tried and is giving good results. It is satisfactory to the women employees and better than the one proposed in every way."

A nation that is desperately attempting a war on unemployment and on the degradation of its standard of living can quickly change its outworn economic views when human needs are put in the first place.

It is essential to see the child in terms of economic crisis, because if there is to be any possible new security of mankind it is first to come through an enlarged security for the child. The story of modern liberty for the worker is the story first of the protection of the child as a worker. Protective measures as to hours of labor and working conditions, which first broke the hold of *laissez-faire* in law and opinion, were designed

to safeguard children. The century and a quarter history of social legislation since 1802 has given a new meaning to human rights in industry, but much that has been achieved to protect the adult worker would not now be on the statute books if children had not first sought the protection of law.

In the present economic and spiritual depression the most practical social policy is to advance the place of the child in the industrial and educational and health program of modern democracy. Primarily the child must not be considered a worker, but a younger citizen in whose all-round training and development the community is concerned. The way out of the depression is through an adventurous experiment of faith in future citizenship. This faith would measure the adequacy of existing economic and social institutions in terms of their contribution to the welfare of the children. If one generation of future citizens is sacrificed by unwise social policy in this depression, the awful cost of recapturing social equilibrium will be felt by many generations. The challenge of the depression in terms of childhood is the most insistent of all social claims at this time. It is not only a most practical relief measure to take the child out of the competitive industrial struggle now, but it would be the wisest statesmanship to build creatively a program of industrial and social recovery around the enlarging needs of childhood in a world which has repudiated its past folly and blindness.

The challenge of childhood to Louisiana is the challenge of security not only to childhood but for all hu-

man needs in Louisiana. So quickly pass the seeming important figures and events of the day that almost while we acclaim the rowdy and tumultuous present the future has become real and takes its marching place insistently along by us. It is necessary then boldly to put the needs of children first in the whole life of the modern community. If there is to be a courageous public school system it must be based upon the larger needs of childhood in a better planned economic and social system. The progress of education and the protection of the rights of childhood are inevitably joined together. Industry can claim no privileges from a democracy determined to protect its human resources at the most critical time of their mental and physical growth. Outworn theories of the Constitution can no longer keep back intervention of the State in the most fundamental of its duties, to establish justice. When justice for childhood has been obtained, the great victory for a more just world has been achieved.

The final security for childhood is in a new kind of world in which the ideals of freedom and the good life have a real meaning in work and education. In a world of blind nationalistic prejudice no child is safe from war; in a world of pitiless social prejudice no child of color or minority religious faith is free from brutal insult; and in an economic system where profits are the sole criterion childhood as cheap labor will be exploited. The challenge of Louisiana is the challenge of the child of today and tomorrow, because even this generation of children is the product of selfish and uneconomic

commercialism. Closed schools and homes of disease and poverty also have left upon their minds and bodies the awful burden of dispossession. But the children of tomorrow can face a dawn of more hope because the wisdom of industry and schools and church and home dares to build a Louisiana fit for children to live in. This is the duty of Louisiana statesmanship today.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION IN THE SOUTH

I

FATHER John A. Ryan of the National Catholic Welfare Council has well said "that with the exception of the Social Security Act and the Labor Disputes Act, the labor legislation enacted in the last quarter of a century by the states or the nation has not been impressive, absolutely considered; but it has been significant and gratifying in the light of American history and American traditions and prejudices." This is true of the nation as a whole. It is true of the South in a special sense.

The social legislation and the labor law of the South can be understood only as they are seen against the background of the history of the South. The predominant interest of the South has been agricultural. It has been only in the past few years that the awful degradation of the share-cropping system and the toll of factory labor upon Southern whites have been known. But now all know the tremendous economic burden that the poverty of the South has put upon its citizens. It is commonplace to remark that the South in her educational and cultural and public welfare institutions has had to struggle under conditions of relative poverty in all the Southern states. Social legislation in the South,

the enactment of labor laws for the protection of the worker, and the development of agencies of administration, all have to be considered in the light of a great people borne down with an intolerable system of farm tenancy and a working class of dispossessed blacks and whites.

The essential tragedy of the South since the Civil War has resided perhaps in this: that selfish interests have been able to screen themselves behind ideals and slogans characteristically Southern and have been able to make plausible if specious appeals to a tradition which they did not mean to fulfill but only meant to exploit and degrade. This for the general situation. A few of the particular aspects of the situation may be mentioned. Public opinion has not demanded protection of the worker or the community. There has been no aggressive workers' organization and labor leadership has nowhere been in legislative power. Religious fundamentalism has given far more attention to mansions in the skies than to decent existence now, and to this has been joined an economic fundamentalism which has proudly vaunted a specious doctrine of individualism. This individualism has unfortunately benefited only the mill-owner and banker and its victims have been the women and children and the male wage earners of the South. The proud South is a myth!

The industrial development of the South began after the Reconstruction period following the Civil War. It was accelerated by economic necessity and the vast supply of raw material and cheap labor. Since the World

War the movement has taken on new life and in the last decade the South has seen a development which has attracted the attention of the entire industrial world. Coming when it did, the industrialization of the South appeared to be an economic savior to the class of people who furnished the labor for these industries. To them and to the entire South industrial life and conditions were an entirely new experience, and the social problems attending so great an economic change were not at first apparent to either the factory worker or the people of the South in general. So dire was the need of the poor whites who turned to the mills for a livelihood that work of any kind under any conditions was enthusiastically welcomed. Employers were regarded as public benefactors, and the public in general was not aware of the need of legal protection for the worker. Leadership was lacking in legislatures and in a labor movement which could give direction to any aims of adequate security for the wage earner.

The pre-depression expansion of industrial development in the South is filled with the tragedy of greed for profits, sordid and squalid mill towns, and cities made ugly by waste of human and natural resources. The countryside was made barren. A new philosophy is not yet dominant. The economic change in the transition from the old agricultural economy to the new industrialism is yet taking place. The South today is keenly (though not so stupidly) alive to its industrial possibilities. State legislatures of this section as well as local chambers of commerce are making appropriations ded-

icated to extensive advertising campaigns to inform the world of the wonderful advantages which their respective localities offer to manufacturing enterprises. The section has developed an industrial complex, which, if judged by its frantic efforts to attract industrial establishments regardless of the social cost, might generously be termed industrial madness.

The South's plea for more industrial plants has not gone unanswered. Its abundance of resources, its low cost of living, its water power, the easy contact of the whole area with the sea, and the additional inducement of partial exemption of industrial plants from taxation offer opportunities to industry which no other section can equal. Added to this are the great present advantages of legislatures unmindful of the necessity of control of industrial development in the Southern region and the lack of a strong organized labor movement.

Twenty-five or thirty years ago the social problems which arose in an industrial community were inconsiderable over most parts of the South, for the region was almost wholly agricultural. This fact is significant in the history of social legislation and labor administration in the South. But today the problems arising from the social implications of industry are serious in all of the Southern states—for all have experienced some degree of industrialization, and there is today a vast industrial South growing rapidly toward a vast industrial organization. In 1930 the population of the twelve Southern states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina,

South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia was 30,953,762. Over one-third of these were gainfully employed, including 9,212,944 males and 2,683,981 females. Employed in manufacturing and mechanical industries were 2,280,963, including 1,957,750 males and 323,213 females. The value of manufactured products was nearly five billion dollars ($4,960,627,000). This is an indication of the South and its economic position.

One other introductory statement may be given before a more detailed account of legislation and administration is set forth. Every student of legislation knows that the test of a law is in its administration. The lack of adequate enforcement divisions in labor law and social legislation is an outstanding weakness in the Southern states. This applies to every phase of social and labor legislation from poor laws to factory inspection. Child labor law enforcement provisions, for instance, in Arkansas, Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, are weak. Even where the provisions of the law are inadequate the actual enforcement may be infinitely worse. The women's hours law is another example. Exceptions or lack of enforcement provisions make even the nominal restrictions of the law practically useless. In North Carolina the 11-hour day for factories is unenforceable because there are no provisions for posting of hours or record keeping —detection of violations is almost impossible under these circumstances. Florida practically has no inspection; Louisiana and Arkansas are without adequate

funds or personnel. The Georgia hours law for men and women is entirely useless. It applies only to textile mills and there is only one factory and child labor inspector for Georgia. The Virginia law concerning masks or shields against fumes, dust, and like dangers is a failure, for the law places upon the employee the responsibility of asking the employer for such guards and the employee must pay for them. The lack of adequate enforcement provisions will render useless any legislation, and it is here that most serious effort must be made by lawmakers and administrators in the South.

The discussion of the departments of labor and other administrative agencies shows that there is a pitifully small amount appropriated for administration of labor law and social legislation. Also, few trained administrators are appointed, the usual administrator being a political appointee with no training for the work that he is to do. Often the agencies of administration are beholden to larger business interests and take their orders from the dominant financial powers of the states in which they live. The reading of the proceedings of the state federations of labor in the Southern states will convince the student of labor history that for the most part the state federations of labor are lacking in vigorous, informed leadership and do not seriously and aggressively fight the causes of organized labor. I refer particularly to the proceedings of the Arkansas, Louisiana and Virginia State Federations of Labor in 1935. The old note of patronage and servility continues with

only here and there a fresh dynamic approach to the needs of the worker. Until there is a strong powerful organization of labor in the South there is little hope for adequate labor law and effective administration.

At the present time it is interesting to note that there are indications of a new invasion of the South by Northern industry. A fresh industrial carpetbag period is here. The term "carpetbag" is used advisedly. For industry is coming to Southern states for the most part in order to escape trade union activities in the North. This is particularly true of the garment industry, especially the cotton garment industry. The makers of men's shirts, and men's and women's working clothes, overalls, cheap house dresses, and other such garments have been notorious for low standards in the North. Even in the case of industries which have quite decent standards, a great majority of these have much lower standards than their Northern competitors. And they have lower standards because the South is not unionized and because the North largely is. These statements apply to paper mills, oil refineries, and manufacturers of chemical and power products. The South has a heritage from the past. Exploiters of her human and natural resources, of course, care nothing about that. The South's heritage from the past, her present way of life, and her future decency and security are only safe when all her citizens, men, women, and children, white and black, can each in his own way know there is security for them in making a living.

II

The industrial system has demanded a tremendous physical cost from the worker. There has been in many places a solid resistance to measures designed to provide insurance against industrial accidents. The present day factory system necessarily makes many occupations dangerous. Yet there are today two states in the Union, Arkansas and Mississippi, which do not have workmen's compensation laws. Alabama, Louisiana, and Tennessee have compensation laws, but have failed to create the necessary commissions for administration, leaving cases to be settled by court action, which is a very serious defect and largely defeats the purpose of the statute.

In most of the other states rates of compensation are very low. The federal government has set the standard in its workmen's compensation law for civilian employees, $26.92 a week maximum. The maximum, state by state, in the South is: Alabama, Georgia, and Kentucky, $15; Louisiana and Texas, $20; Tennessee, $16; Virginia, $14; Florida, $18; South Carolina, $25.

The Alabama compensation law was amended in 1931 to include a provision common to a number of states in other parts of the country, giving double compensation to children illegally employed. The extra amount is a direct charge upon the industry itself and not its insurance carrier, and acts as a deterrent to employing children illegally. Special legislation with

regard to liability for accidents to children is needed in every state.

The problem of occupational diseases has hardly been considered by the legislatures of the South. In the Virginia State Federation of Labor meeting in 1935 it was urged that special caution be taken in including occupational diseases because of the fear that if the list was extended no occupational disease would be included. North Carolina added to its compensation law in 1935 by including the occupational diseases of silicosis and asbestosis. South Carolina in 1936 is considering a "reasonable occupational disease clause."

In Arkansas a workmen's compensation law has been enacted which applies only to employees of the state. In every gubernatorial election since 1928 one of the campaign issues has been the need of an adequate compensation act, but labor has not been strong enough to overcome the lawyers' lobby against the bill in the Arkansas legislature. The Secretary to the Governor of Mississippi in a letter March 28, 1935, commented on Mississippi as follows:

> In his first and second campaigns for the Governor's office, Governor Conner stressed the necessity for a workman's act in Mississippi. He did not, however, in his third campaign for the reason that the various labor groups in Mississippi were divided upon the question. The brotherhood of railway trainmen, as well as certain lawyers of the State vigorously opposed the workmen's compensation act. Other labor groups are in favor of the law, but they were not sufficiently organized to make an impression upon the legislature.

The Governor has always regarded the workmen's compensation law as fundamental in the interest of labor and promoting industrial development.

However, no law was passed.

The workmen's compensation laws of Alabama and Louisiana and Tennessee are administered by the courts of these states; in the remaining Southern states similar laws are administered by industrial boards or commissions. North Carolina provides an administrative organization of a commission of three members appointed by the governor for terms of six years, with one term expiring every two years. This gives the commission a continuity of policy in administration. This organization is similar to that of Virginia, South Carolina, and North Carolina, which seem to be the most effective of the states of the South. Agreements between the parties with regard to the terms and amounts of compensation are permitted. Reasonably adequate information is required to furnish a check on the settlements made. Accident reports giving all necessary information must be filed with the commission by the employer, and another report is required upon the termination of the liability. Either party may apply to the commission for a hearing in case of dispute. The decision of the commission is final as to questions of fact, but appeals may be taken to the courts on questions of law. The commission may upon its own motion before judicial hearing or upon the application of any party in interest upon the ground of change in conditions revise at any time and make a new award, ending,

diminishing, or increasing the compensation previously awarded.

The machinery of administration of the workmen's compensation codes in the South is worth noting. It indicates general tendencies and the large importance of administration in labor law. The states of Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Tennessee and Texas administer the compensation laws through commissions. In all these states disputed claims may be taken to the courts on appeal for final settlement. The compensation laws of Alabama and Louisiana and Tennessee are administered by the courts. In Alabama the compensation commissioner has limited supervision in the administration of compensation laws in conjunction with the courts. The commissions of North Carolina, Virginia, and South Carolina are full-time officials. Georgia provides a similar administrative organization composed of two existing officials and two full-time officials appointed by the governor. Georgia permits limited appeals to the appellate court and thence to the Courts of Appeals. In Tennessee settlements are permitted between parties, but must be approved by the county court before they are binding. Reports by means of which a substantial check can be made on the terms of the agreement are filed with the Division of Workmen's Compensation of the Department of Labor. In case of dispute either party may submit the matter to the county court, and the evidence is heard and a decision rendered by the judge. Appeals may be taken to the next term of the circuit

court where the case is tried *de novo,* and appeals may be taken thence to the Supreme Court by means of writs of error. All settlements by agreement where the amount of compensation does not exceed the compensation for six months' disability are final and not subject to readjustment.

The effort was made in Louisiana in 1934 to amend the workmen's compensation act but the Louisiana State Federation of Labor was unwilling to include such an amendment in its legislative program. The Louisiana legislature meets in 1936. The principle is now accepted that it is essential to the successful operation of the workmen's compensation law that a board or commission be created to administer the act. Only nine of the fifty-one American workmen's compensation acts are still administered by the court.

Only a beginning has been made in workmen's compensation legislation. It is basic in labor law. State compensation laws should be a vital force in accident prevention in establishing the liability of industry for the costs of workers' risk. Alert and responsible administration of the law will provide a fuller protection for the employer and the employee. The last two workmen's compensation laws, Florida and South Carolina in 1935, assessed the cost of administering accident compensation upon insurance carriers.

The importance of getting legislation on the statute books and the development which may be expected from adequate administration is well illustrated in the Workmen's Compensation Act of South Carolina

passed by the 1935 legislature and signed by the Governor July 17, 1935. Before the 1936 legislature are the following recommendations of Mr. John H. Dukes, Chairman of the South Carolina Industrial Commission:

(1) The elimination of the exempted classification of industry from the terms of the act; (2) The inclusion under the terms of the act of all industries employing more than five employees instead of present exemptions up to fifteen; (3) The inclusion of a reasonable occupational disease clause; (4) The increase of disability allowance from 50 to 66 and two-thirds per cent of average weekly pay; (5) The reduction of the number of waiting days from seven to three; (6) The increase of the maximum death benefits from $5,500 to $7,500; (7) The increase of the tax on insurance carriers and self-insurers to 4.6 per cent to make the South Carolina Act conform with that of other states, so that the South Carolina Industrial Commission might be made self-sustaining; (8) Arrangement for state, county, and political sub-divisions to comply with the act.

Only four Southern states, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia, require safeguards on dangerous machinery in all cases. Lack of administration makes the law useless for the most part. Two states, Florida and Kentucky, require safeguards where minors are employed. It is notorious that in the cotton mills of the South there is a lack of guards against accidents. It is encouraging to note that Governor

A. B. Chandler of Kentucky on October 16, 1935, told the Kentucky State Federation of Labor that he would give Kentucky a "real" Labor Department. He promised a Department of Mining that would create safe conditions of labor and fix responsibility of enforcing the mining laws.

III

With the coming of industry to the South whole families flocked to the mills for employment. The families, as a rule, were large and the wages were low. Children sought employment as a matter of economic necessity in the majority of cases rather than as a matter of choice. The effects of unregulated child labor are of dire consequence both to the child and to the welfare of the community and state of the immediate future. Not least of the ill effects is the thwarting of opportunity and the dulling of intellect of the child laborer, to say nothing of his outlook on life and his attitude toward society.

At present all Southern states forbid the entrance of children into manufacturing before the age of fourteen years, but in many states there are qualifying exceptions which weaken the law considerably. Some of the states place the prohibition on other employments than manufacturing. In Florida children under fourteen are prohibited from working in any mill, factory, mechanical establishment, laundry, or on the stage. There is a twelve-year limit for work in stores, offices, or transmission of merchandise or messages in cities of

6,000 population or over. Employment of children under sixteen is forbidden in a fairly comprehensive list of occupations and places which are considered physically or morally dangerous or hazardous, and the county physician or city health officer has power to extend the list. Children under eighteen may not clean machinery in motion, and there is an eighteen-year age limit for night work. Permits are required for children under sixteen years of age who are employed in factories, workshops, laundries, mills, or mines. These permits are granted by the school authorities and must contain documentary proof of age, school records showing proficiency in certain subjects, and, in cases appearing doubtful to the issuing officer, a physician's certificate showing physical fitness.

Virginia permits children of twelve to fourteen years of age to work in canneries during the summer months. It is made mandatory that a child be examined by a physician as to physical fitness before becoming employed. Other Southern states which require physicians' certificates of physical fitness for children employed in industry are Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Under the Florida law it is optional, and South Carolina, Mississippi, and Texas have no such provisions. However, Mississippi provides that the county health officer must inspect as to health and sanitary conditions establishments where child labor is used.

Only four states have required employment certificates for children sixteen years of age. Alabama re-

quires an age certificate for children of sixteen, except in agriculture and domestic service. Georgia requires a certificate for minors sixteen to eighteen years for night work in certain occupations. Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, and Tennessee limit the employment of children under sixteen to eight hours a day and forty-eight hours a week. Mississippi and Virginia have the eight-hour day, but a forty-four hour week exempting canneries. North Carolina has an eight-hour day and a forty-eight hour week only for those children fourteen to sixteen years of age who have not completed the fourth grade, for the others, an eleven-hour day and a sixty-hour week. South Carolina and Georgia have the same working hours for children as for adults. Night work is prohibited to children throughout the South, but South Carolina permits children to work as late as nine o'clock in the evening to make up time lost on account of accident to machinery, and Texas forbids the employment of children between the hours of ten in the evening and five in the morning only.

The Texas law prohibits the employment of children under fifteen years of age to labor in or about any factory, mill, workshop, laundry, or messenger service in towns of over 15,000 population. Penalties may be imposed for the employment of children under seventeen years of age in any mine, quarry, or place where explosives are kept. Fines may be imposed upon persons who permit children in their employ to work more than eight hours a day or forty-eight hours a week. Under certain limited conditions, where the

child has finished the fifth grade in school and where his earnings are necessary to support some relative, a child over twelve years of age may secure from the county judge of his county a permit to work. It must be stated, further, that nothing in the Texas Child Labor Act applies to the employment of children for farm labor, or to hours which children may work on farms, ranches, or dairies, or in other stock-raising pursuits.

With regard to the Child Labor Law of Texas the commissioner of labor reported: "In closing this biennium (1933–1934) we find that a four year period has elapsed without the necessity of filing a case for violation of the Child Labor Law, and during the past two years there have been but two complaints reported to this Department, in both of which immediate corrections were made." This is certainly a commentary on both law and administration. The enactment of legislation in 1931 providing for a Child Welfare Division in the Board of Control and supplementary legislation evidences the fact that children are receiving more attention in Texas than formerly. Texas required in 1935 that minors must attend school until sixteen years of age.

There is some form of factory inspection in all the Southern states, providing an administrative machinery for the enforcement of child labor laws. All the states except Mississippi require that permits to work be issued by school officials or by some state authority. Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Virginia go farther

and require the state to issue forms for employment certificates and to direct local officials to send duplicates of issued certificates to the state central agency, thus insuring a better supervision over the employment of child labor.

The employment of minors is directly curtailed by compulsory school attendance laws where the labor laws themselves do not forbid such employment. Every state in the Union requires all children between specified ages who do not come within certain exemptions to attend school, and a majority of them require attendance the entire school session. Of the Southern states, Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia require attendance for the entire session, and Georgia stipulates six months' attendance. South Carolina requires attendance for four consecutive months, or eighty days, and upon petition of a majority of the qualified electors of a district, school attendance can be made compulsory for the entire session. The law of 1932 prohibited child labor during school hours except upon certificate. Texas provides a minimum attendance requirement of one hundred days or of the entire session if it is less than that number of days. The minimum attendance required in Mississippi is eighty days. In Louisiana attendance is compulsory the entire session in the Parish of Orleans, and one hundred and forty days or the entire session if less than one hundred and forty days in the other parts of the state.

In none of the Southern states is employment in

agricultural pursuits specifically enumerated as one of the exemptions to the compulsory school attendance law, although in North Carolina the State Board of Education may describe the conditions under which exemptions may be had for farm demands. Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Kentucky, and Tennessee require attendance to sixteen years. Louisiana requires attendance until sixteen in the Parish of Orleans and until fifteen in the rest of the state. Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas require attendance until the age of fourteen years, Virginia to fifteen, and Mississippi until seventeen. Alabama, Kentucky, and Louisiana exempt from the compulsory attendance law children who are fourteen years of age and employed. Florida exempts children who are fourteen, employed, and enrolled in a part-time school, and children who have completed the eighth grade. Louisiana and Mississippi exempt those who have completed an elementary school course. In Tennessee the law does not apply to children who have completed the eighth grade, or who are literate, fourteen years of age, and employed, but Texas excuses from the operation of the law those minors of twelve years who have completed the fifth grade. The Virginia law does not apply to those who have completed the prescribed elementary course and who are regularly and lawfully employed.

The educational qualifications required before an employment certificate can be legally issued are lower in the South as a whole than in most of the other states. Alabama, alone, requires that the applicant should have

completed the seventh grade, and by Act 356 of 1931 this is raised to include the completion of the eighth grade after September 1, 1934. Special certificates may be issued to children over fourteen for employment after school hours for no more than four hours a day or twenty-eight hours a school week. Florida and Georgia require that the child should be able to read and write.

Child labor in agricultural pursuits, because of the large number of children who engage in this type of work and the conditions under which the work is actually done, presents a situation almost as serious as industrial child labor, but the problem is far more difficult to solve. Children work on farms wherever crops are raised, but eleven states, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, have approximately 75 per cent of the total number of children reported by the United States Census as employed in agriculture. These are among the states that lead in the production of cotton and tobacco, both of which require a large amount of hand labor. These statistics do not show the type of labor which the children perform, as the census enumerators were directed to count as children engaged in agricultural pursuits those who work away from home as farm laborers or "somewhat regularly assist their parents in the performance of work other than household work or chores." The greater number of children working on farms in the South is accounted for, at

least in part, by economic conditions and the type of farming. Tenancy is more prevalent here than in any other part of the country, and it is largely on a crop-sharing basis. In many cases the tenant's principal, if not only, contribution is the labor supply, and the number of acres of cotton or tobacco he can cultivate is determined by the number of children he can put to work in the fields. The economic status of many farmers, especially these tenant farmers, appears to offer some justification for the use of the labor of the farmers' own children. Even under good conditions it requires the labor of the entire family barely to make a living.

The attitude of the South to the Child Labor Amendment is worth recording. Alabama rejected the Child Labor Amendment in 1935; Florida rejected it three times—1925, 1933, and 1935; Georgia twice—1924 and 1935; Kentucky twice—1926 and 1934; Louisiana twice—1924 and 1934; Mississippi in 1934; North Carolina twice—1934 and 1935; South Carolina three times—1925, 1934, and 1935; Tennessee twice—1925 and 1935; Texas four times—1925, 1933, 1934, and 1935; and Virginia rejected the Amendment twice—1926 and 1934. The Jackson *Daily News* in commenting on the resolution of Mr. Reed from Adams County that the 1936 legislature ratify the Child Labor Amendment declared: "Mississippi can well afford to follow the action of the former legislature and discard the amendment." Mississippi leads the nation in child labor employment.

There are noteworthy tendencies in the South with reference to the larger aspects of child health and welfare. It is in this field that most of the outworn creed of a sterile individualism in industrial protection is being quickly overthrown by alert leaders who see the child as the chief concern of the state.

Alabama, in 1923, established a Child Welfare Department Commission, the duty of which is "to seek out through investigation, complaints from citizens or otherwise, the minor children in the state who are in need of its care and protection, and shall as far as possible through existing agencies, public or private, or through such other resources, aid such children to a fair opportunity in life." Georgia has a Children's Commission, whose duty is to study the laws of Georgia and other states which affect child life, and to present proposals to the legislature that will better safeguard the welfare of the children of the state. In 1928 Kentucky established a children's bureau. This bureau is authorized "to assist in the establishment of county children's bureaus, and cooperate with such bureaus as have been established, and with all agencies, institutions and associations concerned with the welfare of children." In 1927 North Carolina established a Child Welfare Commission. This commission is charged with enforcing laws relating to children, particularly child labor laws. In 1921 Oklahoma established a Children's Commission for the purpose of studying laws relating to children and making recommendations to the legis-

lature on the basis of such findings. In 1922 South Carolina created a State Board of Public Welfare which is empowered, and the duty is imposed upon it, to visit once a year or oftener all institutions which have charge of custody or training of any class of children. In 1931 a child welfare division was introduced in the State Board of Control in Texas. In Tennessee the State Department of Institutions exercises those functions which children's commissions or bureaus perform in other states. A Children's Code Commission reported in 1934 in Louisiana.

The reports in the past few years of the Commissioners of Labor and Child Welfare Directors in the Southern states prove the fact that the administration of laws relating to child labor was greatly helped by the provisions of the National Recovery Act which affected children. Texas and Alabama reports make special notice of this fact. It appears certain that the protection of the child through state action can be supplemented through the protection and support given by a National Child Labor Amendment.

IV

The Social Security Act as enacted by Congress makes certain provisions for old age pensions, aid to dependent children, provisions for pensions to the blind, federal old age pensions (insurance), maternal and child health services, services for crippled children, child welfare services, vocational rehabilitation, public

health services, and unemployment compensation (insurance). It is thus readily seen that the American people have entered upon a new period in dealing with the problems of social security.

To secure assistance from the Social Security Board for Old Age Pensions, Aid for Dependent Children, and Pensions for the Blind, each state must first submit to the Board at Washington for its approval a plan for the administration and the expenditure of these funds. The plan for each type of assistance must be *state-wide*. If the plan is administered by local political subdivisions (counties or cities), the plan must be mandatory upon all of them; but, in any event, it *must* be in effect in all political subdivisions (counties and cities) of the state. In other words, each and every county must become a part of and participate in distributing the type of assistance for which each state requests funds of the Social Security Board. Furthermore, it is required, that each state advance funds of its own to assist in the plan. It is also required that *a single state agency* must administer the plan for the state, or supervise the plan if it is administered by counties and cities.

Below will be given the progress made in the Southern states in meeting the conditions laid down in the Social Security Act. It may be well briefly to sketch provisions in the Southern states down to the enactment of the Social Security Act of 1935 dealing with mothers' pensions, aid to dependent children, and old age pensions.

Old Age Pensions

Social policy is indicated in the provision made for all the citizens in the community. Yet it is significant that the tragedy of an unsecured old age had been given so little legislative attention until the National Security Act gave tremendous impetus to what is a national disgrace. Kentucky was the only state in the South prior to the National Security Act which had such legislation. Kentucky passed such a law in 1926, being the fourth state in the Union to enact such legislation. In order to qualify for an old age pension in Kentucky up to 1936 the party making application must have been seventy years of age, a citizen of the United States for fifteen years and a resident of the state and county for ten years; the maximum pension was $250 a year. In Kentucky the agency immediately responsible for the determination and payment of pensions was the county. The Kentucky act was practically inoperative, due in large part, it would seem, to the poverty of the counties. The act provided that the counties might inaugurate the scheme when they saw fit. It appears that only one county out of one hundred and twenty in the state adopted the system. Such was the story of old age pensions in the South.

It is interesting to record that, heeding the personal plea of Governor Chandler, the Senate of Kentucky on February 14, 1936, voted for pensions of $15 a month for indigent Kentuckians over sixty-five after rejecting, at the governor's request, a proposal to in-

crease the amount to $30. The bill had then been passed by the House and was ready for the governor's signature as soon as the House had concurred in several technical amendments.

It may well be made a matter of the history of social legislation in the South that bills for old age pensions were introduced before 1935 in the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. The platform of several candidates for governors even before 1934 included old age pensions.

Mothers' Pensions

Closely related to labor legislation for children are the child welfare laws and mothers' pensions. Since the motivating factor behind mothers' pensions is the welfare of the child, the two shall be considered together. In this connection we are not concerned with the juvenile delinquent, mental defective and other types which require special care. We are concerned only with the dependent normal child. The general theory underlying relief through mothers' pensions is that home life of the proper sort is one of the most potent factors in social progress, and that a child should be deprived of its benefits only under urgent circumstances. Financial misfortunes of worthy parents do not alone constitute such circumstances. A changing attitude in social policy is plainly seen in the development of legislation affecting the American family. The South here forgets again, in part, its ancient lore of meaningless individualism. The conference on care of

dependent children held at Washington in 1909 set forth the following standard: "The home was declared to be the highest and finest product of civilization and no child should be deprived of a home except temporarily. The home should be broken up only for reasons of inefficiency and immorality and not for poverty. Children should be kept with their mothers unless the latter are unfitted to care for them properly. Mothers should be given help in accordance with the relief policies of the community, preferably from private rather than public sources."

The earlier attitude, as is here expressed, that relief should come "preferably from private rather than public sources," has changed, and today it is generally accepted that the ultimate responsibility for the children's welfare rests on the state.

The Children's Bureau at Washington in 1919 reflected a larger grasp of social policy when it declared that: "Every child should have normal home life, an opportunity for education, recreation, vocational preparation for life, and for moral and spiritual development in harmony with American ideals and the educational and spiritual agencies by which these rights of the child are normally safeguarded. The Conference recognizes the fundamental rôle of home, religion, and education in the development of childhood."

The principle of mothers' pensions has the advantage of keeping the child at home under the influence of his mother, and, furthermore, does not carry with it

the stigma of being a pauper or ward of charity. Another excellent feature of mothers' aid is its effective way of aiding in enforcing child labor laws by removing the economic necessity of child labor.

Up to the passage of the National Security Act forty-six states, the District of Columbia, Alaska and Hawaii granted public aid to children in their homes through mothers' pensions. New Mexico and Alabama were the last two states to enact such legislation, both having done so in 1931. The two states in the Union which made no provision for aiding indigent mothers were Georgia and South Carolina. In all the states it was required that the mother be a fit person to have the custody of the child, that the child be living with its mother, that such relief be necessary in order to save the child or children from neglect, and that such relief will avoid the necessity of the mother's being employed away from home for more than a specified time. The Virginia law provided for an allowance to the expectant mother who was in need, and when it was necessary to save the mother and child from neglect. The Louisiana law permitted a continuation of benefits until the child reached the age of eighteen years under certain conditions, otherwise it was to cease at the age of sixteen years. Other Southern states having the sixteen-year limit were Florida, Mississippi, Texas, Virginia, and under certain conditions, West Virginia. Tennessee had an age limit of seventeen years, Arkansas had the fifteen-year limit, and Oklahoma and North Carolina limited aid to children of less than

fourteen years of age. In Mississippi and Virginia no amount was prescribed and no limitation was placed on the amount which might be awarded. Louisiana provided for an amount of $15 a month for one child and $10 for each additional child, the total allowance not to exceed $50 a month to any one mother. North Carolina made the same allowance as Louisiana except that the maximum allowance was limited to $40 a month to any one mother. Tennessee allowed $15 for one child and $10 for each additional child, while Florida allowed $25 for one child and $8 for each additional child.

In Tennessee the aid was specifically extended to unmarried mothers, to mothers whose husbands were dead, confined in the state penitentiary, mentally or physically incapacitated, and mothers who were divorced, or who had been deserted by their husbands. The West Virginia law provided that mothers whose husbands were incapacitated, or who had been abandoned, or who had children under the age of sixteen years who were not eligible to a work permit, were entitled to the mother's pension. Virginia and Florida granted relief to mothers who were divorced or deserted and whose husbands were dead, insane, or incapacitated, and Florida further required that the child attend school the full school term when such child was of school age. Texas was the only Southern state which limited aid to a widowed mother. Florida and Virginia included the guardian, female relative, or custodian, if the child was dependent upon them,

and the Virginia law included the step-mother among those who might be given aid.

Florida, North Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia, out of sixteen states in the United States, were the Southern states requiring residence both in the state and in the local administrative unit. Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas, out of seventeen, mentioned residence in the local administrative unit only. Nine states, including Mississippi and Virginia, left it to the administrative agencies to determine what amount should be adequate. The other states provided for a maximum amount that might be granted to each child. It varied from $2 a week in Vermont to the most liberal allowance in Ohio of $35 a month for one child and $10 for each additional one, without a specified family limit. In North Carolina, as in nine other states, the state and the locality shared in the expenses. In Florida and Louisiana there was no state supervision over mothers' pensions other than the submission of annual reports. The supervisory powers of state agencies in North Carolina and Virginia were very general, such as advice and cooperation with the courts in order to promote uniformity and efficiency.

V

The employment of women in various occupations is not in itself an evil. In fact, an occupied adult population is desirable under proper conditions. The evils to be avoided in the employment of women are long hours of employment, sweating, low wages, unfavor-

able health and sanitation conditions, and the sacrificing of other values, especially in the case of married women.

According to the last census, South Carolina had the highest percentage of employed women of any state in the Union, one woman out of every three in that state being employed. In the Southern states the percentage of employed women runs from 17 per cent in Tennessee to 21.9 per cent in North Carolina, 25.8 per cent in Alabama, 26.7 per cent in Georgia, and 29.1 per cent in Mississippi. In the chief cotton producing states the percentage of women is highest. This is accounted for by the large numbers of Negroes in these states, Negro women furnishing a large part of the labor required in raising cotton.

Factory employment probably makes the greatest demands on the physique of laborers. It will be observed that the percentage of women gainfully employed who are engaged in manufacturing is comparatively low in the South. In North Carolina, a highly industrialized state, about 22 per cent of the women gainfully employed are in manufacturing. This is the same percentage as that of the entire United States. In Tennessee the percentage is 15, in Georgia and South Carolina 10, and in Mississippi and Alabama three and six per cent respectively. With the growth of the textile industry in the South the number of women employed has steadily increased but the percentage of women employees in relation to men employees has decreased. Now there are more men employed in

Southern textile industries than women, the latter constituting approximately one-third of the labor force. This is a smaller proportion than in New England.

All the Southern states except Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas allow women to work at least ten hours a day. Alabama and Florida have no laws limiting the hours women may be employed. All states except Mississippi have a seating law, requiring employers to provide seats for female employees when the nature of the work will permit it. The Florida seating law provides for male and female workers. Twenty-two states and the District of Columbia have no legislation regulating the conditions under which women may work at any specific occupation or excluding them from employment at any occupation in any industry. Nine of these are Southern: Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas limit the hours of work for women to nine hours a day and fifty-four a week, with exceptions. Arkansas excepts workers in plants handling perishable goods by authority of the Industrial Welfare Commission, and railroad companies regulate by federal law. Louisiana excludes from the operation of the law women working in plants or factories handling perishable foods, stores on Saturday nights, and stores, cafes, and such establishments in places of less than 2,500 population. Exceptions to the Texas law are numerous provided double pay is given

for the excess. North Carolina limits the hours of employment of women workers in manufactories, except seasonal industries, to eleven hours a day and fifty-five a week. In other occupations there is no limitation of hours for women workers. Georgia, Kentucky, and Mississippi limit the employment of women to ten hours a day and sixty a week. Kentucky has no exceptions to the operation of the law, but Georgia and Mississippi both have exceptions which make the law difficult to enforce. The Georgia law includes both men and women, but it applies only to cotton mills and woolen mills. Kentucky and Mississippi laws are comprehensive in their scope. South Carolina provides for a limit for both men and women workers to ten hours a day and fifty-five a week in cotton and woolen manufacturers, yarns, cloth, hosiery, and such industries, but a twelve-hour day and sixty-hour week for women in mercantile establishments. Virginia has a limitation of ten hours a day but no law concerning the total hours per week that women may work. An eight-hour day is before the 1936 Virginia legislature. Tennessee allows a ten and one-half hour day and a fifty-seven hour week for females employed in all manufacturing establishments.

There is no prohibition of night work at any occupation at which women are allowed to work in the South except in South Carolina where women are not allowed to work in stores after ten in the evening. In 1934 an act to prohibit the employment of women or children to work or labor in mercantile or manufactur-

ing establishments was passed. Sixteen states of the Union prohibit night work in some way. There are thirteen states and Puerto Rico which have provided that a period of time, varying from thirty minutes to one hour, must be allowed to women workers for the noonday meal. Only two Southern states, Arkansas and Louisiana, are included in this group. Twelve states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have statutory provisions to the effect that a woman may work only a fixed number of hours, usually five or six, without either a meal or rest period of some kind. Again, Arkansas and Louisiana are the only Southern states having such a statute. The number of hours that women may work has been limited in forty-three states, but only eighteen states have provided that women workers must have one day of rest a week, or one shorter work day a week, or time for meals or rest period. Only one Southern state provides that women may not work over six days in succession. This state is Arkansas, but Virginia has accomplished this limitation by a codal provision prohibiting work on Sunday. Minimum wage laws are unheard of in the Southern states except for a statute in Arkansas, which has been declared unconstitutional. A proposed minimum wage for women was abandoned in the 1936 legislature.

A true picture of the situation of women workers in the South cannot be painted in terms of statutes and legal provisions alone. As compared to what might be considered almost ideal legislation on the subject the South is far behind, but before an ideal can be accom-

plished it must exist in the minds of the people. The attitudes of the manufacturers themselves, in many instances, have changed. Part of the story of overproduction can be told in terms of long hours and night work for women and minors. In this connection there has been a voluntary limitation of hours to a certain extent in the textile industries. In 1929, a manufacturer whose mills are located in North and South Carolina wrote a letter to the President suggesting a national study of the cotton textile industry, in which he suggested the following as a standard of operating time: permanent reduction of weekly hours to fifty, to pay the same wage for fifty hours that was paid for former schedule; as rapidly as possible to transfer all women on night to day work. He expressed the belief that these reforms would benefit the industry and "give employees more leisure and a higher standard of living." The Cotton Textile Institute proposed a general reduction of operating time to be achieved by voluntary adoption of the following schedule: fifty-five hours per week for day work; fifty hours for night work; the complete elimination of minors under eighteen and women from night work. It was hoped that the elimination of minors and women from night work would greatly reduce night operation. However, in a radio address delivered June 3, 1931, George A. Sloan, President of the Institute, stated that nearly 85 per cent of the cotton industry had accepted the proposed schedule. Mr. Sloan also pointed out the injury done to the industry by the refusal of some units to cooper-

ate in this voluntary reduction of operating time. He said: "Of course, there are a few extreme individualists who, through utter disregard of the better interest of the industry, its employees and customers, persist in operating abnormal hours day and night including the continuous employment of women and children during the unnatural period of work between sunset and sunrise. It is bad enough for human beings to work at night—a time more appropriate to family life and rest, but under no circumstances, emergency or otherwise, should night employment of women and children be tolerated by the public.

"I can conceive of no reason for this practice on the part of a few mills unless they calculate that it will be profitable for them to operate in this way only because the great bulk of the industry is showing the necessary intelligent self-restraint to avoid the evils of overproduction and the impairment of steady employment. But time is the great curative and surely logic and reason combined with public sentiment will correct these uneconomic and unsocial practices which, unhappily, still exist in some textile centers."

Here and there intelligent social leadership from manufacturing in the South is found, but for the most part progress is made only through an aroused public interest and by an active and alert organized labor movement.

The enforcement of the law, concerning hours of labor and labor conditions affords a real insight into the conditions which actually exist. Miss Lucy Ran-

dolph Mason, able and intelligent leader, in her study *Standards for Workers in Southern Industry,* has compiled a table of the limitation of hours and night work for women employees in which she rates the enforcement provisions of the several states. Those of Arkansas, Kentucky, and Virginia are rated as good; those of Tennessee are rated as fair; those of Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas are rated as poor. The Georgia law has no enforcement provision; Alabama and Florida have no limitation of hours or night work for women.

A bill for a ten-hour day and fifty-five hour week which had the support of "liberal" manufacturers was killed in committee in the 1931 legislative session in Alabama. The child labor inspector unavoidably learns the hours of women workers in plants he visits; therefore, the chief child labor inspector of Alabama was able to write in June, 1931: "Practically all of the better mills in the state worked a ten-hour-day and a 55-hour-week before the agreement (for voluntary limitation of hours in the cotton textile industry). . . . We have mills in the state running 12-hour shifts regularly. A week or so ago I inspected three mills running day and night on 12-hour shifts. The day run people have time allowed for dinner, the night run people usually eat on the job. The night run people work five nights. We also run across overtime. A factory which may be running fourteen hours a day is likely to be closed a week later. As far as I can see these manufacturers are making to order and are rushing these orders.

They work overtime and then shut down altogether. This is not true everywhere, but we run across it often enough to indicate that it is not an unusual situation." The latest Alabama report indicates a complete lack of an adequate enforcement and administrative staff.

The fact that the larger number of Alabama textile manufacturers have found it possible to reduce daily and weekly hours to ten and fifty-five is evidence of the necessity of a law that will bring other plants in line with these standards at least. Not only in manufacturing, but in other occupations as well, hours for woman labor in Alabama are of unreasonable length. The 1930 census shows that 24,636 women were employed in Alabama manufacturing establishments alone, to say nothing of those employed in mercantile establishments and other places of employment.

The census shows 15,972 women in industry in Florida. The Woman's Bureau made a study in the autumn of 1928 covering 163 establishments employing 7,844 women and embracing factories, hotels, restaurants, stores, and laundries. A long schedule of more than fifty-four hours a week was reported by more than one-third of the white women and more than two-thirds of the Negro women. In plants putting up food products a sixty-hour week was common. A Saturday holiday of less than six hours was enjoyed by 14.3 per cent of the white women and much less than half of the colored women. The survey shows that a large number of women employed in stores work much longer hours on Saturday than any other day.

The Georgia law of ten hours a day and sixty per week for "all persons employed" in cotton and woolen textile plants does not deter mills from working as long hours as they desire. The U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics *Monthly Review* of November, 1930, gives average full time work and wages in representative textile plants in all the states, taken from a typical week in that year. This table shows Georgia to have the longest average hours of operation—fifty-six and five-tenths per week. This table is given in full below. It shows the average hours and wages of women workers in the cotton textile industries for November, 1930, based upon representative cotton mills in eleven states, with actual hours of work and wages paid in a week. States are listed according to lowest hourly wage rate.

State	*Hours*	*Hourly Rate*	*Weekly Wage*
Alabama	55.2	.217	11.98
Georgia	56.5	.232	13.11
South Carolina	54.8	.24	13.15
Virginia	54.8	.246	13.48
North Carolina	55.0	.257	14.62
Maine	53.8	.304	16.36
Massachusetts	48.0	.353	16.94
Connecticut	50.7	.341	17.29
New Hampshire	53.1	.379	20.12
New York	47.7	.40	19.08

North Carolina's wage is only $2.32 below that of Massachusetts, but the North Carolina hourly average is 9.6 cents less per hour and the North Carolina

women averaged seven more hours per week. The Virginia hourly average fell below that of North Carolina for the first time in 1930, and that was the year in which the Danville textile mills effected a wage reduction which resulted in a prolonged strike.

The suggestive summary of Miss Elizabeth L. Otey in her article "Women and Children in Southern Industry" (*Annals of American Academy*, January, 1931) will indicate one aspect of the problem of protective legislation. She writes: "In the absence of a strong labor movement, southern sentiment has not been aroused to the plight of its women workers. Consequently, laws for their protection have been slow in the making and just at present seem to be at a standstill. There is perhaps a historical reason for this. In 1907, a federal investigation into the condition of woman and child wage earners showed 9,607 children fifteen years of age and under at work in the cotton mills of the South that were visited. This situation, grave and spectacular, demanded immediate legislative action, and put the major emphasis on child workers to the detriment of women. There was little controversy about the iniquities of working children, although at the time voices were heard declaring the mill a healthy place for children, better than running wild on the streets, the inescapable alternative; but one might have one's doubts as to the wisdom of shortening hours for women, thus curtailing production and killing the goose that was laying the golden egg. In addition, the National Child Labor Committee, organ-

ized in 1904, took hold vigorously, and unremittingly pushed its legislative program for the protection of children through the state legislature. Persons were lacking to fight the battles of working women."

VI

Administration is the law in action. It is the test of effective security for the worker. And here the South fails most completely.

One of the chief evidences of the development of a social conscience on the subject of protection for wage earning people is found in the organization, personnel, and appropriations of the department of government established to administer labor laws and safeguard the rights of workers. The Department of Labor is an essential feature of state government and is so recognized by the older industrial states. Industrial laws can only be effective when administered by a capable and sufficient personnel with adequate funds for travel and record keeping. This sound administrative policy was given by Miss Mary Anderson, director of the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, in an address delivered in Greensboro, N. C., on March 7, 1931, and later printed under the title, "Women's Place in Industry in Ten Southern States." But it is a principle violated in the administration of labor law in every American state. Miss Mason, along with many others, has strongly shown the failure in the South. In her *Standards for Workers in Southern Industry* it is pointed out that: "The amounts spent

for factory inspection are relatively small amounts in most of the Southern states. In reporting on the costs to the various states of protection to person and property in 1928, the United States Department of Commerce shows that in the country as a whole factory inspection accounted for 2.9 per cent of the total spent for such protection. In the ten Southern states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia) under consideration, however, less than one per cent of the cost of protection to person and property was for factory inspection."

Not all Southern states have departments of labor, and some place factory inspection with agriculture and commerce.

A summary of the administration of the Departments of Labor is given state by state.

Alabama: total gainfully employed, 1,026,295. Alabama has a Department of Labor for which the last appropriation was $20,000 a year. It was organized in September, 1935. The Commission of Labor is appointed by the Governor for a term of four years, but is terminable by the Governor. The Commissioner of Labor's salary is $3,600 a year, and he is assisted by a Chief Clerk and Secretary. The duties of the Department of Labor are the enforcement of all laws relating to hours of work, child labor, working conditions, mediation and conciliation, and collection of statistics. In the Department there is a division of inspection and statistics with two factory inspectors; and there is a

child labor division of which the director also acts as inspector. It has been indicated that workmen's compensation is court administered and the reports are made to the State Insurance Commission. It is significant that one clerk constitutes the entire force on this work and there is no specified appropriation. There is a Bureau of Mines which administers Coal Mine Inspection Law.

Arkansas: total gainfully employed, 667,845. A Bureau of Labor and Statistics was established in Arkansas in 1913. The labor laws of the state are administered by a commissioner of labor, a deputy, a statistician, and secretary, an Industrial Welfare Commission, a chief boiler inspector, assistant boiler inspector and clerical assistants. The appropriation is $20,800. It is an interesting commentary that in the last biennial report the Commissioner of Labor reported that it had been the experience of the Department of Labor that, with but a few exceptions, enforcement was not had through local cooperation.

Florida: total gainfully employed, 598,939. When the Workmen's Compensation Law was enacted in Florida last year, the Industrial Commission of three members was created for its administration. It is understood that the following inconspicuous clause was inserted in the bill with the idea that it might become a nucleus for a labor department: "Additional duties connected with labor may be designated by the Governor for performance by the Industrial Commission." Florida has a State Labor Inspector who is appointed

by the Governor for a term of four years. The salary of this officer is $1,800 plus an allowance of $1,000 for traveling expense and all other expense. The duties of the State Labor Inspector are the enforcement of laws relating to child labor. The Industrial Commission, of which the chairman is appointed by the Governor, is composed of three members who serve for a term of four years at a salary of $4,200 per year. The duties of the Industrial Commission is the administration of Workmen's Compensation Law and also the investigation of safety provisions and causes of injury. Expenses of administration of the Industrial Commission are assessed against carriers. Two other members, selected by the Governor from his cabinet, are to serve without additional compensation on the Industrial Commission.

Georgia: total gainfully employed, 1,162,158. Georgia has a Department of Industrial Relations which is composed of three members, one of whom may represent labor and one employers. The Chairman is the Commissioner of Commerce and Labor, who is elected for a term of two years at a salary of $4,800. The Chairman is assisted by two directors who are appointed with the advice of the Senate for a term of four years at a salary of $4,000. It is important to note that all these officers work full time. The appropriation for the Department of Industrial Relations is $10,000 plus the amount assessed according to law against insurance carriers for administration of workmen's compensation. The duties of this department are the en-

forcement of laws relating to child labor, hours for women, regulation of private employment offices, operation of public employment offices under the Wagner-Peyser Act, and the collection of statistics. There are also under this department a Division of Commerce and Labor and a Division of Workmen's Compensation. The duty of the Division of Workmen's Compensation is the administration of Workmen's Compensation Law.

Mississippi: total gainfully employed, 844,905. There is a State Factory Inspector in Mississippi. This inspector is appointed by the State Board of Health, and he receives $2,600 per year for his services. The appropriation for the State Factory Inspector for the two years of 1934 and 1935 was $9,100. The duties of the State Factory Inspector are the enforcement of laws relating to child labor, hours of labor for women, and the registration of factories and collection of factory registration fees. He is assisted by the County Sheriffs who are responsible in part for the enforcement of the child labor law. The County Health Officer aids the inspector by inspecting factories where children are employed; he investigates the condition of the premises and of the children. The 1936 legislature will consider the creation of a Department of Labor.

North Carolina: total gainfully employed, 1,140,971. North Carolina has a Department of Labor for which the last appropriation was $41,250. The Commissioner of Labor is elected for a term of four years at a salary of $4,500. The duties of the Department of

Labor are the enforcement of laws relating to child labor, hours for women, Sunday law, and the regulation of private employment offices. Under the Department of Labor is a Division of Standards and Inspections which has authority over the mines and is responsible for the promulgation of rules and regulations governing work places and working conditions. There is a Division of Statistics for the collection of statistics; and there is a Bureau of Labor for the Deaf. The Free Employment Bureau under the Department of Labor supervises the operation of public employment offices under the Wagner-Peyser Act and has an appropriation of $95,526.66, which sum is to be matched by federal funds. The Division of Workmen's Compensation (Industrial Commission), has an appropriation of $47,005. This division has three full-time commissioners who are appointed by the Governor for a term of six years at a salary of $4,320 per annum. The chairman, however, receives $4,800 a year. The duty of the Division of Workmen's Compensation is the administration of Workmen's Compensation Law.

South Carolina: total gainfully employed, 687,737. There is a Commission of Agriculture, Commerce and Industries in South Carolina. The Commissioner of Agriculture, Commerce and Industries is elected for a term of four years, and his salary is $3,600 a year. The appropriation for the Commission of Agriculture, Commerce and Industries for the year 1935–1936 was $110,322.63. It is the duty of this commission to enforce laws relating to child labor, hours of labor, spec-

ified health and sanitation measures, and race segregation in cotton textile factories. The Commission is also responsible for the collection of statistics. Under the Commission of Agriculture, Commerce and Industries there is a Division of Labor, composed of two factory inspectors, which investigates the conditions of employment pertaining to safety and sanitation, and with respect to employment of women and children. The appropriation for the Division of Labor was $3,528, not including expenses for supplies, clerical help, and travel. The Industrial Commission has five full-time Commissioners, appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of six years at a salary of $3,000. There may not be more than two representatives of employers and not more than two representatives of employees. The Chairman of the Commission may not be classed as one in either group. The Industrial Commission administers the Workmen's Compensation Law. Its appropriation for the year 1935–1936 was $40,000.

Tennessee: total gainfully employed, 958,386. Tennessee has a Department of Labor headed by a Commissioner of Labor who is also Fire Marshal. The Commissioner of Labor is appointed by the Governor for a term of two years at a salary of $4,200. The legislature appropriated $209,954 for the operation of the Department of Labor and the State Employment Service during the biennium 1935–1937. Under the Department of Labor there are a Division of Mines which enforces the laws relating to mines; a Division

of Hotel Inspection which regulates employment in hotels; a Division of Fire Prevention for ventilation and protective fire inspection in places of amusement; a Division of Factory Inspection for the enforcement of laws relating to child labor, female labor laws, including those concerned with seating, separate toilets, and hours, semi-monthly pay days, industrial homework, fire escape regulation for certain factories, safety and sanitary regulations for factories and workshops, including foundries, manufacture and sale of mattresses, and the regulation of private employment agencies; a Division of Workmen's Compensation which collects records and serves in advisory capacity to workers in connection with Workmen's Compensation cases (law is administered by the courts); and a State Employment Service for the operation of public employment offices under the Wagner-Peyser Act. The Commissioner of Labor is given wide administrative powers.

Texas: total gainfully employed, 2,206,767. The Thirteenth Biennial Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the State of Texas states that never in the history of the Labor Department since its creation in 1909 has there been a time when adequate facilities for law enforcement, economic research work, and accurate statistical compilations were of such paramount importance. On account of the meager resources and facilities allotted to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the task of meeting these requirements was impossible of accomplishment. The Bureau of Labor Statistics had

an appropriation of $82,959.41 for the biennial period ending August 31, 1934. The Bureau is headed by a Commissioner whose salary is $3,000 a year. Coming directly under the supervision of the Labor Department are nine of the Labor Laws, as follows: The Child Labor Law, Nine Fifty-Four Hour Law, Health Safety and Comfort Law, Employment Agency Law, Emigrant Agency Law, Spider Law, Semi-Monthly Pay Day Law, State Mining Law, and Boxing and Wrestling Law.

Louisiana: total gainfully employed, 815,616. In Louisiana there is a Department of Labor and Industry with a Commissioner, two assistant Commissioners, and Secretary. The Secretary acts in general capacity as statistician, collecting statistics and making a biennial report. The duty of the assistant Commissioners is to inspect throughout the state. For Orleans Parish (New Orleans) there is a factory inspection department with a factory inspector, office assistant, and vocational guidance expert. This Department administers Child Labor Law in New Orleans and Orleans Parish only. In common with most other Southern states Louisiana has no separate Bureau for women and children. The general department is alone responsible. The total yearly expenditure of the Department of Labor and Industry is less than $12,000, salaries accounting for $8,400, traveling expenses $2,862. In 1933 the expenditure of Orleans Parish, which is the City of New Orleans, the largest city in the South, was $7,548.

Kentucky: total gainfully employed, 907,095. In Kentucky the enforcement agency is the Department of Agriculture, Labor, and Statistics. The Labor Bureau includes a Commissioner, Chief Labor Inspector, four assistant Inspectors, and one clerical assistant. The Inspectors and clerical assistant compile the statistics and the biennial report. Factory inspection is administered by one Chief Inspector, who may be either a man or a woman, two men assistants and two women assistants. There is no separate bureau for women and children workers. The general Department is alone responsible. The total expenses of the Labor Bureau must not exceed $18,000. Each Inspector receives $1,596. Governor Chandler is pledged to make the Labor Bureau a real administrative agency of Kentucky's state government.

Virginia: total gainfully employed, 880,211. Virginia has a Department of Labor and Industry over which is a Commissioner of Labor, who is appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate for a term of four years at a salary of $5,000 per year. The appropriation for the Department of Labor and Industry was $53,905 for the year 1934–1935 plus $15,565.86 of federal funds for maintenance of employment service. The duties of the Department of Labor and Industry are the enforcement of laws relating to child labor, hours of labor, regulation of private employment agents and agencies, payment of wages, and health and fire escape regulations in specified places of employment. Under the department there are a Divi-

sion of Women and Children, a Division of Factory Inspection, a Division of Mines and Quarries, a Division of Research and Statistics, and a Division of State Public Employment Service. The State Public Employment Service is responsible for the maintenance of free employment offices under the Wagner-Peyser Act. There is a Department of Workmen's Compensation (Industrial Commission) for which the last appropriation was $97,841. The Commission is composed of three members appointed by the Governor for a term of six years. The salary of each of the members of the Commission is $5,200, while the Chairman receives $5,400 per year. There may not be more than one representative of employers or of employees.

VII

When President Hoover began the national policy in his administration of spending millions of dollars for relief, it was evident that a turning point had been reached in the history of social legislation in the United States. The most powerful industrial nation on earth had blindly forgotten the protection of its workers. England, France, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries had built up a system of social legislation, and protective law for the worker. The issues of American independence for all the people are now at stake. Economic security in the twentieth century is the condition for the stability of American institutions. The right to life, liberty, and happiness will be written into

the national and the state constitutions of the twentieth century in the United States. It is to be hoped that they will be written in wisdom and in justice and not forced by the dispossession and the insecurity of the great mass of the American people.

A landmark was reached in the history of social legislation in the United States when the President sent his message to Congress on January 17, 1935, accompanied by the report of his Committee on Economic Security. He declared: "A program of economic security, as we vision it, must have as its primary aim the assurance of an adequate income to each human being in childhood, youth, middle age, or old age—in sickness or in health. It must provide safeguards against all of the hazards leading to destitution and dependency."

As yet no Southern state has completely accepted the Social Security Act; that is, the Social Security Board has not officially approved the States Unemployment Compensation Act and State Plans for Old Age Assistance, Aid to Dependent Children, and Aid to the Blind. However, Dr. Frank Bane, Executive Director of the Social Security Board, in a letter to the writer has said, "Almost every one of these states has manifested a real interest in social security legislation."

The Social Security Board by February, 1936, had approved the Unemployment Compensation law and the plans for old age assistance and aid to dependent children in Alabama. In Mississippi the Board had approved the plans for old age assistance, aid to depend-

ent children and aid to the blind. The Board had approved the North Carolina plan for aid to the blind.

Plans for the administration of old age assistance are now being formulated by Florida, Oklahoma and Texas, but none of these states has as yet actually submitted a plan to the Social Security Board. With the legislatures of at least four Southern states—Virginia, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Kentucky—in session at the present time, there are possibilities of additional legislation during the next month or so.

On February 13, 1936, when the administration's social security program got underway, checks totalling $3,336,622 were mailed out to sixteen states for old age assistance, to eleven states for aid to the blind, and to twelve for aid to dependent children. This federal aid is to be matched dollar for dollar by the states in the case of aid to the needy aged and blind, and two state dollars to one federal dollar in aid for dependent children. Included in the checks were the following allotments for Southern states: for old age assistance—Alabama, $105,000; for aid to dependent children—Alabama, $48,000; for old age assistance—Mississippi, $183,750; for aid to dependent children—Mississippi, $32,355.

The provisions of the Social Security Act in their broad outline were noted in Part IV of this paper. Apparent at once is their effect upon old age pensions, aid for dependent children, and child welfare, as well as unemployment compensation. Following is a brief outline of what has been done through February 20,

1936, in the Southern states to meet the conditions of the National Security Board with regard to cooperation of the Federal Government and the state governments in carrying out the provisions of the Social Security Act:

Arkansas. Governor Futrell of Arkansas in 1935 appointed a committee to study the unemployment insurance act and to draft a measure to be submitted to the legislature. The Arkansas legislature meets in January, 1937, and it is the view of E. I. McKinley, Commissioner of Labor, that security legislation should be considered during a regular session of the legislature rather than that a special session should be called during a "political" year. The fact that so few legislatures meet in 1936 would seem to indicate that there will be an adjustment made by Congress with regard to those states whose legislatures do not meet until 1937. The Arkansas legislature established through Acts 26, 321, and 322 in 1935 a State Department of Public Welfare. The Governor is chairman of the Commission and Mr. C. H. Andrews is Commissioner of Public Welfare. There is a commission of eleven members serving without pay. In each county of the state a public welfare board is designated. Act 321 provided for the creation of a Welfare Commission fund from which appropriation is made for the payment of old age pensions, for state relief of distress, and to aid unemployables. This act was passed (Section 5) for the purpose of matching federal aid and for carrying out the duties of the Department of Public Welfare in paying old age pen-

sions and giving aid to needy unemployables. Act 322 created an old age pension system, defined the old age pension fund, specified those eligible to share in the distribution of the fund, and made other administrative provisions. The administration of the old age pension fund is under the direction of the Department of Public Welfare and this Department has broad authority to make rules and regulations. Governor Futrell also appointed a state-wide Social Security Committee to study legislation necessary for Arkansas to enact to meet the conditions of the Social Security Board. On February 15, 1936, Governor Futrell said he was confident that the government would allocate funds to Arkansas to match state monies spent since last summer in aiding the blind and the aged. A study is being made of state laws for aid to dependent children. A monthly allotment of $75,000 has been extended to counties for unemployables.

Alabama. The Social Security Board has approved the Unemployment Compensation Law and the plans for old age assistance and aid to dependent children in Alabama. The administrative agency in Alabama is the State Department of Public Welfare, and the local administrative agency is the County Department of Public Welfare. The functions of the Child Welfare Department of Alabama have now been absorbed by the Department of Public Welfare, with the exception of the enforcement of the state child labor law, which has been transferred to the Department of Labor. The Attorney-General of Alabama has publicly stated that

Alabama will carry out fully the provisions of the National Security Act.

Florida. Florida in 1935 passed an act creating a state board of social welfare. Governor David Sholtz appointed in December, 1934, the Florida Commission on Social Legislation. The bill as presented to the legislature was the work of the Commission and of those employed by the State Board of Public Welfare, with the assistance of the Florida emergency relief administration. It is well to point out that the Florida law differs primarily from the usual state welfare laws in that it sets up the administrative system on a district rather than a county basis. It is said that this system was adopted because of the impossibility of successfully organizing sixty-seven different county boards in a state as thinly populated as Florida. Mr. James Donn, Chairman of the State Board of Social Security, says that the act was written at the time the National Social Security Act was being prepared, and that the attempt was made to insert in it the provisions necessary for the state to participate in the benefits of the Federal Act. The State Board of Social Welfare is composed of Mr. Conrad Van Hyning, Commissioner, and seven members. The State of Florida is divided into twelve administrative districts, over each of which is a district welfare director. The Chairman of the State Board of Social Welfare says further change and improvements both to widen the scope and to conform definitely to national measures will be presented at the next session of the legislature in 1937.

Georgia. Action in Georgia is brief. On January 10, 1936, Governor Eugene Talmadge wrote the present writer: "The last session of the General Assembly passed a resolution advocating an old age pension in Georgia, but I vetoed the measure as I do not feel that the State is financially able to support an old age pension at this time."

Kentucky. The Kentucky legislature is to meet in 1936. The regular session, as noted above, passed the old age pension act. It is reported in the press that Governor Chandler intends to call a special session.

Louisiana. In 1934 under the chairmanship of Professor Harriet Spiller Daggett of the Louisiana State University Law School a formal report of the Louisiana Children's Code Committee, appointed by the Louisiana Bar Association and the Louisiana Conference for Social Work, was presented. This report provided for the establishment of a State Department of Public Welfare and Parish Departments of Public Welfare. It received state-wide support, but did not come before the 1934 legislature. The Louisiana legislature meets in May, 1936. Governor-elect Richard W. Leche, whose administration promises to be forward-looking and constructive, has pledged the administration to the establishment of a State Department of Public Welfare. It is also possible that his administrative program will include a State Department of Labor, reorganizing the present Bureau of Labor and Industry, which is not adequately financed or staffed for its work.

Mississippi. The legislature of Mississippi is now in session and there is strong pressure for substantial legislation for a State Department of Public Welfare and a State Department of Labor. Prior to November, 1935, Mississippi had no Department of Public Welfare supported from state funds. The Emergency Relief Administration for Mississippi served that purpose, but was operated on federal relief funds. During the extraordinary session of the legislature, 1935, a department of public welfare was created under the name Mississippi State Emergency Relief Administration. The purpose of that department is to furnish aid to needy aged persons, blind and crippled persons, and dependent children. The department was created upon the refusal of the Federal Government to furnish funds for the care of unemployables.

North Carolina. Governor John C. B. Ehringhaus in a letter of January 10, 1935, reports on North Carolina in the following statement: "Replying to your question of what action, if any, has been taken in North Carolina to bring into effect legislative measures to carry out the provisions of the National Security Act, I may say that our legislature adopted a measure on its closing day looking toward a set-up of an unemployment insurance activity. This measure had to be adopted before completion of the federal legislation, as our legislature was due to adjourn. Up to the present moment the National Security Board has not approved the set-up provided in our act, though we still hope to secure its approval. The next regular session

of the North Carolina Legislature will meet in January, 1937. The Federal Act, as you recall, was not adopted until August last year, after our regular session of 1935 had adjourned."

South Carolina. There is a temporary State Department of Public Welfare in South Carolina. The legislature is now in session. On January 18, 1936, Mr. John H. Dukes, Chairman of the South Carolina Industrial Commission, wrote that the South Carolina legislature is anticipating passing enabling acts to benefit from the Federal Social Security program. Mr. J. D. Fulp, Commissioner of Temporary State Department of Public Welfare in South Carolina, made the following report on his state on December 23, 1935: "South Carolina has already taken steps for developing the program for meeting the requirements in the Social Security provision. (1) The Governor has appointed a temporary State Advisory Board of the Department of Public Welfare. (2) The Emergency Relief Administration has been transferred to the Temporary Department of Public Welfare with the former Relief Administrator made temporary Commissioner. (3) A Social Security Committee has been appointed by the Governor consisting of nine members from the General Assembly. (4) The legislation for the Department of Public Welfare has been drafted and legislation for Old Age Assistance, Aid to Dependent Children, and Aid to Crippled and Blind is in process of being drafted. (5) The final federal grant made by FERA to South Carolina was made for the purpose of assisting

in the establishment of a Department of Public Welfare through: first, allowing administrative costs for county units for a period of six months; second, through matching funds from the counties for the care of unemployables; third, the staffs left in the counties will be used for accepting applications and making the necessary investigations for persons eligible for participation through Social Security provisions. We are asking that the counties set up their temporary welfare units as early in January as possible. The matching funds will be made available for January, February, and March. It is estimated that South Carolina will have passed proper legislation and set up the required machinery for participation in the Social Security Funds by the first of April."

Tennessee. Tennessee has not passed any legislation embodying provisions of the National Social Security Act. This is the report of Mr. W. E. Jacobs, Commissioner of Labor of the State of Tennessee, speaking for Governor McAllister on January 23, 1936.

Texas. Texas has passed an act known as the Old Age Assistance Bill administered by a State Department to be known as the Texas Old Age Assistance Commission. The law became effective on February 14, 1936.

Virginia. The legislature of Virginia is now in session. On December 20, 1935, a report on unemployment compensation was presented to Governor George C. Perry. The chairman of this committee of seven was Mr. John S. Battle, who presented recommenda-

tions submitted by the Governor's Advisory Legislative Council together with the proposed bill. A bill has also been presented to the Senate to provide for Old Age Pensions and to provide that the State Commissioner of Public Welfare administer the provisions of the act.

VIII

The sound basis of progress in human values is not so often stressed in the broadcasting of industrial progress by the capitalists of the depression era. It is typical to read such pronouncements as that by the late Mr. George Long, president of the Louisiana Manufacturers Association, given before the public hearing on the women's eight-hour bill by the Senate Capital and Labor Committee in 1932. He declared that "the passage of a bill limiting the work of women to eight hours a day and establishing a 48-hour week will be burdensome to both industry and to the women. It will make it harder for Louisiana manufacturers to compete with the manufacturers in other states that are not under such regulations. It will increase our production costs, and so give our competitors an advantage which will be reflected in smaller production, and reduced employment." The Louisiana law was not changed by the 1932 legislature. Virginia faces this legislative question in 1936.

A similar attitude of reaction is implied in the opposition against the organization of labor unions in the South on the part of the large manufacturing interests

and the financial interests which are behind many of the promotion schemes in the South. The docile labor supply of the South has been the insulting advertising slogan of many firms and industries. The proud South is to them a myth. This is given in the 1932 *Blue Book of Southern Progress* by the Georgia Power Company with great persuasiveness. It is pointed out that in the cotton mills of the Southern states, spindles increased 139,076 during 1931. Of this growth, Georgia had 59 per cent. In the same states, cotton looms made an increase of 5,176 and of this total, Georgia's figure was over 40 per cent. What was the moral drawn by the Georgia Power Company for the whole nation to read? Here it is: "Outstanding among the sound reasons (why Georgia leads) is the type of labor which Georgia offers. Fair-minded, straight-thinking, eager—the workers of Georgia weld her resources and advantages into a productive tool which creates profit for themselves and those whose investments make production possible." The reader may again read in this paper legislative and administrative measures for the protection of the worker and the Georgia community in the light of this statement.

The acceptance of a system of industrial relations implied in the statement of the president of the Louisiana Manufacturers Association and in the boastful advertisement of the Georgia Power Company is challenged in the South today more than in any previous period of the South's history. The bloody, sordid story of Marion and Gastonia and Elizabethton is one epoch,

and is a landmark in the rise of a working class movement in the South. Tenancy and share-cropping is another epoch. Public opinion will yet create conditions of pressure. This opinion will be stirred by a convinced people of the South that profits and prosperity based upon the human resources of childhood and womanhood and manhood are not worth the awful price demanded by mill owners and bankers. When the South knows the terrible penalty of child labor there will be reaction which will find speedy expression in law. Not a Southern state is in the lowest ratio of states having its boys and girls at work. And a Southern state, Mississippi, leads with the highest proportion of child labor of any state. South Carolina leads in women workers. Mississippi has 30.7 per cent of its boys and 18.8 per cent of its girls at work. It is not difficult to understand the problem of building a state-wide educational system when the youth of the state is in work harness.

The future in the South is with the leaders who will use the present period of revolt against an unenlightened industrialism and will create a powerful bulwark through legislation and a labor movement against exploitation of the people of the South. There is a deep human appeal behind social legislation in the South. This appeal at the present is not deeply grounded in an awakened social conscience which would demand a new economic order; but leaders who know what is needed can certainly inform and guide by their instruction and make possible substantial gains in legisla-

tion and community organization. Critics awake to the waste of unemployment, students of the tragedy of unsecured old age, advocates of wider health and industrial protection for women and children, leaders who are eager for a militant labor movement in the South, all these are better prepared for intelligent action than the political leaders of the South are prepared to accept the obvious lessons of human misery and the breakdown of an uncontrolled and undirected industrial system. Public opinion has moved faster than certain politicians believed was possible. Their votes already have recorded their realization of the change in political opinion and the shift in the power of labor at the polls. Federal legislation of a most drastic kind has come. This may be the real beginning of a saner and more just social order in the South. But so long as the attitudes of the past prevail, and they have by no means disappeared in this era of new deals, hope for anything better is mere illusion.

The South in her new strength has yet the chance to build her foundations on a conception of justice and liberty which has some meaning for men and women in the twentieth century. It is imperative now that the South judge the excellence of its economic organization by the degree to which it contributes to the well-being and the happiness of Southern men and women and children.

EDUCATION AND INSECURITY

EDUCATION IN A WORLD OF INSECURITY

THE year of 1936 is a year of insecurity.

Man has always been insecure in the struggle for existence. The great difference between the conditions of the contemporary scene and those of a simple and primitive society is that insecurity was not so overwhelming a menace to the peace of mind of the individual, nor was it so devastating a community catastrophe. Even the earlier agricultural economy of this nation allowed a certain quality of what may be termed "scarcity independence." Independence is certainly scarce now. Insecurity in 1936 of the individual and of the nation is insecurity in an economy of abundance. Carlyle called the insecurity of his industrial England "the liberty to starve." Hoover called this liberty euphemistically enough "rugged individualism." The Liberty League prefers not to talk about it.

Today the individual lives in a world of insecurity, which destroys his strength of body and denies him through unemployment the moral respect due to a worker making an honest living. Conditions of insecurity for millions of citizens haunt the councils of state legislatures and the national Congress. Business is either greedily predatory on an adventitious basis, or is seeking government subsidies. The economic struc-

ture which should provide welfare becomes without social idealism or economic thought a system of breadlines rather than a wisely planned basis supporting the good life of all the people.

The significance of the age of insecurity in which we live in 1936 is this: personal and social insecurity have been joined on a world-wide scale. It matters little if, for a brief time, peoples under a dictatorship attempt to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The wanton destruction of the small gains of security for the individual within the nation under the rule of law and of the hopeful steps internationally toward collective security under the reign of law for nations will destroy the prospects of civilization. To thwart the aims of personal, social, and international security is a concession to chaos. Social justice for the worker cannot be achieved by fiat. The mere passing of workers' legislation is certainly not the protection of the wage earner; administration alert and aggressive must follow each act passed. International peace cannot be achieved by fiat. The high-pious statement of nations to create the conditions of peace under the League of Nations does not give integrity to national purpose in the field of international relations, nor does it guarantee that powerful nations will act justly.

The insecurity of 1936 is dominated by the war-madness of the race for international armaments leading down to 1914. The race is on now in 1936. This age still lies brutalized under the paralyzing aftermath of the awful tragedy of 1914–1918. The madness in

peace of the years from 1919 to 1936 has not yet run its course, and all of mankind awaits the verdict of history upon the insecurity of the peoples of the world. The processes of education in democracy have not prepared nations to organize the machinery of peace. We educate to destroy. This is the social planning of democracy. The state is degraded; the individual is exploited.

Insecurity in its spiritual and in its material forms has characterized the twentieth century. Professor Whitehead in his *Science and the Modern World* said that the last quarter of the nineteenth century was one of the dullest stages of thought since the time of the First Crusade. He declared the period was "efficient, dull, and half-hearted." No such flattering appraisal can be made of the first thirty-six years of the twentieth century. So far there is the boastful vaunting of an industrialism that cannot guide itself nor provide security for the worker; and there is no control of the international relations of nations: war is accepted. Education nowhere is a great imaginative effort to make democracy function in terms of individual and social security.

The insecurity of 1936 is cumulative in its immorality. The respect given the individual as a personality in industry is denied. The basic recognition of the fact that the nations of the world are made up of peoples, flesh and blood, and should not be victims of a saturn-like nationalism, devouring its own children, is not established in international relations. We relegate moral-

ity to the so-called salvation of the individual and the peoples of the world cut one another's throats. Then we wonder why we starve. Then we wonder why we live in social insecurity. Then we wonder why there is international anarchy.

The citizen is insecure as a worker because the present industrial system is not able to give him work, or will give him work only at a price. The price is the exploitation of the worker as a human being, and the price to society is not paid completely even with this. For the social cost of burnt-out, exploited human beings—cinder heaps of industrialism—must be paid for finally by the public out of huge taxation funds. Hospitals, feeble-minded institutions, insane asylums are part of the social costs. Taxation pays for these.

The citizen is insecure as a patriot—a lover of his country—because the institutions of democratic government are war-ruled (a medieval conception), and he cannot give his loyalty to working out life, liberty, and happiness under any possible condition of freedom for the twentieth-century citizen. This is the dilemma of citizenship in an industrial and nationalistic world.

The hunger years since 1929 have threatened the American way of life. This way of life has been a magnificent story of an expanding civilization from frontier to a nation of 120,000,000 people. The ideals of independence and of work and of character have been built into the social institutions of American life. The enemies of the American way of life in 1936 are unemployment, disease, insecurity in old age and in child-

hood. The American way of life must go on. The purpose of the American people cannot be less than to create in this century the sure foundations of life, liberty, and happiness for the American people. Bishop Blake, before the General Methodist Conference at Columbus, declared that, after seven years of the country's worst depression, there were still 12,000,000 of unemployed, despite vast government expenditures. Among 20,000,000 still on the breadline were 8,000,000 children under the age of sixteen. "If this conference, faced by these conditions, can keep silent, the stones of the streets will cry out against us," he added. "This is no time for neat neutrality. It is the time for the church to lift its voice in demanding a change for an economic order that will give all persons a share in the good things of life."

Education must also contribute its mighty influence in the effort of these times to maintain and forward the American way of life. There is a duty of the educated mind to assert authority in chaos, to face the present scene and attempt to bring order out of chaos. Education has social and economic and cultural duties today it has never had before.

The social responsibility of education is accepted in the American democracy. The tax-supported system of public education cannot be isolated from the aims of democratic government. Education in a democracy, to maintain integrity in its own aims, must be a creative power in making the system of democracy work.

There can be no theory of education as a demon-

strated way of life which does not see a great decency in human existence. It is therefore of much educational significance that education today concerns itself with the purposive objectives of individual and social—or collective—existence.

Social security legislation is democracy's way to maintain the American way of life. Social security legislation should provide financial assistance to dependent children; extend old-age assistance to men and women who reach the age of 65 years; establish a state-wide system of financial and other assistance to the blind; initiate services for the health of mothers and children, especially in rural areas; establish and maintain adequate health services; provide medical, surgical, corrective services and care for crippled children; promote local child welfare, especially in rural areas; and expand vocational rehabilitation for the physically disabled. Such a program of social security would be laying a basis for democracy to build a finer civilization. It would be only the beginning, because the great aims of democracy are to be continually written into the laws of the land. The twentieth century will see a new kind of state, for better or for worse. It is characterized today by internal strife and by external conflict. These are growing pains; but if there is wisdom in citizenship and in statesmanship out of complex and conflicting change, a saner civilization will be established.

Today there are those who would seek an inglorious complacency, who would retreat from the difficulties

of building an America in which Americans are secure. In May, 1920, at Boston, Mr. Warren G. Harding said: "America's present need is not heroics but healing; not nostrums but normalcy; not revolution but restoration; not surgery but serenity." The Republican candidate for the presidency in 1920 based his campaign on "back to normalcy." That very phrase today echoes the barren era of normalcy. A gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Alf M. Landon, who has his hopes for election to the presidency by the Republican party, said this disquieting, and perhaps to-be-classic, phrase: "The election will be decided by the people with moderate minds." In 1920 it was *back to normalcy,* and in the year 1936, the phrase is *the moderate minds.*

The aims of education in a world of insecurity are not to be defined by what "normalcy" meant to Mr. Harding, nor perhaps what "moderate minds" means to Mr. Landon. This age demands a wisdom and a daring if education is to guide creatively democratic life. It is better to look to the words of Aristotle. He talked of the critical mind and the noble mind. He believed that to be critically minded is to live, and those noble in mind best serve the state. The mind of Jesus gives its critical power to an ever-widening consciousness of a common humanity, and his nobility of mind comprehends universal aspiration. When the half-gods go the Gods arrive. That hour is now in American life.

The American way of life in its great traditions and with its great hopes for the future, and its present confused insecurity, will be what the American philoso-

phy of education in democracy demands it to be. Education in a world of insecurity cannot evade the responsibility of knowing the dangers which threaten the American way of life. Evasion of responsibility is intolerable cowardice in the insecurity of 1930. It will only delay for a brief time the incalculable calamity of a policy of drift. Social values will be destroyed and individual hopes frustrated if a more secure way of life is not soon the American way.

Education in a world of insecurity must know the danger to the American way of life of a present industrial system in which the machine is master. The economic system is wrong, is uneconomic, when man and his needs are not the master of the machine. There can be no security for the worker in a system where profits are the end of production. The final test of industry is a moral and spiritual standard: does industry make its full contribution through the use of men's energies, enabling them to live the good life?

Education in a world of insecurity must know the danger to the American way of life in the present mad international scene when frenzied nationalism is the master. War is the inevitable result when the minds of men are not prepared for peace. Education in a democracy can dynamically take its part in laying the foundations upon which the necessary institutions of peace machinery can be built. The social and economic insecurity of the United States in 1930 is closely linked with international anarchy. It will ever be until the world is at peace. Public Enemy Number One to the

American way of life is *War* and the conditions which make war possible.

The year of 1936 is a year of economic insecurity, and it is a year of baffling international political insecurity. Education, the great social process which leads man's mind to know himself and contemplate (and perhaps enjoy) the unfathomable mystery of life, has its duty to look into the abyss of human affairs. But a more profound danger besetting the American way of life education must seize upon. There is in 1936 a desperate spiritual insecurity in the honest hearts and minds of all who look out with intelligent love upon a bewildered world of fellow human beings. The spiritual insecurity of American civilization can destroy America—the America that really is: a land of social idealism and a land of keen zest for living. The institutions of democracy can only function when there is economic justice. The spirit of democracy is quick to great issues only under conditions of creative freedom, and when each citizen is conscious of his active participation in the community.

The America of 1936 is insecure in its way of life because there is the failure to build a juster and a saner world. Here, then, is the high duty of education in a world of insecurity. Education can in fresh militancy declare that man's body and man's mind shall not be given in servile surrender to the twentieth-century machine-ridden and war-ridden systems, but that education should set forth on a long-time engagement to create conditions of freedom.

THE TRADITION OF SCHOLARSHIP IN A WORLD OF INSECURITY

THE great traditions of mankind are the ennobling securities of civilization. The spirit of man is always restless when this spirit feels the impact of ideas. Tradition in itself is the cumulative power of an idea. Ideas affect directly the acts of men and the workings of institutions. The long-range effect is history. Today decisions about the civilization of this century are being made. It is well to consider the part that the tradition of scholarship embodied in the university idea has in the destiny of this century.

The academic world is in direct line of the great adventure of mankind. To know is to be free. To understand what the individual is, and to understand the world in which we live, is to be spiritual. In a fine sense it is to be contemporary. The everlasting effort of man to be at home with himself and his daily world combines the story and the pageantry of scholarship informing the spirit and tradition buttressing man's hopes against chaos.

There is no reason in our philosophy of education unless academic training is translated into security. This security must include the individual and the society in which he lives. Security is no abstraction. It is

the working out in justice of ideals of freedom and good living. The duty of education in a world of insecurity is to inspire courageous citizens to build a cooperative civilization of security.

The tradition of scholarship is not the ornament of past ages. The tradition of scholarship which has a meaning in a world of insecurity in 1936 is a tradition which is quick to the vast dispossession of the good things of life in the minds and in the bodies of men and women and children who live under a covenant of insecurity.

This covenant of insecurity is not sacred. It is an accidental thing. It is upon 1936 because, as Sir Arthur Salter suggests, it was thought that the world in which we live is a self-regulating and self-directing world. In 1914 collective suicide was entered upon, and from Versailles to Addis Ababa collective insecurity has been the policy of nations.

Collective security under conditions of international peace has not been given a chance.

The international scene is insecure from the Mediterranean to the Siberian wastes. International anarchy is the rule in world politics. There is no community of nations. Within each nation there is individual and social insecurity. Civil warfare and strife between classes forbid a real community within a nation.

The plea for social peace among the classes within a nation has never been so insistent. Yet a Liberty League philosophy would prevent an ordered reconstruction of the way America can survive an un-

planned industrial system. A brilliant writer, Herbert Agar, in his preface to *Who Owns America*, commented recently, "A few more Liberty League dinners and the plain man will turn against Liberty."

The conscience of the world has outlawed war. Yet the budgets of every nation are this year war budgets in peace time. The hands of scholars have touched across the frontiers of nations; across the barriers of race and time creative minds have built an international community of conviction. Yet armed camps are the campus for all the world. Because of this fact, truth and freedom of inquiry and speech are even now casualties of these warlike peace times.

Dictators use the honored forms of the university tradition to their own political ends, and wherever fascism exists the university is merely an agent of its propaganda. Teachers are then the prostitutes of politics. "Above all nations is humanity" is in a world of insecurity an unfulfilled—seemingly hopeless—ideal. But so long as there are institutions of good will, and men of good will who make a valiant effort to use them, the duty of scholarship is to declare the way of reason is the way of life for nations.

The world may well be in 1936, as Professor Shotwell suggests, "on the rim of the abyss"; but to a world grown almost accustomed to its madness of strife the scholar should speak with the prophets of old that they who take up the sword shall perish by the sword. From the lonely hour of fratricidal murder when Cain killed Abel to the thunderous rumors of the next great war

runs the wild despair of all the spirit of peace and life which has been given as a useless sacrifice to force. War may come, but it will come because the institutions of peace have not been built strong enough to withstand the domestic anarchy within nations and international anarchy among the peoples of the world. The wisdom of the ages challenges the civilized world yet to reconstruct the League of Nations for effective functioning as an institution of peace. It is of incalculable advantage to attempt to rebuild the peace machinery before another war lays waste the energies of all mankind.

The contemporary scene confronts the scholar with its vast difficulty of knowing its own direction. Leonard Woolf in his *Quack Quack!* has these words, which guard against airy optimism: "The history of the human race is the history of the ebb and flow of civilizations. The ebb and flow of civilizations can always be observed very clearly in politics, in the way in which peoples and nations regulate their communal life. Some hundreds of thousands of years ago man was merely an animal; his politics were the politics of the jungle. If you want to see what his communal life was then, you may study the ways of the jackal, the wild ass, and the wild swine; the laws which he then obeyed are still observed by the hippopotamus and the tiger; his psychology was that of the savage, morose ape which you may see sitting in the zoological gardens in a cage upon the bars of which is the notice: 'Danger. This Animal Bites.' In the jungle there is no civilization at all;

it is pure, unadulterated savagery and barbarism. The jungle, however, has its communal life, its politics, even its laws, but they are the communal life, politics, and laws of savagery. They are determined by violence, ignorance, superstition, fear, lust, hunger, and thirst."

Scholarship is a great tradition of humane existence. Always the mind of man at its best has raised the levels of action in personal conflict and in economic-social controversy. The code of decency in human relations is a by-product of the belief that the world in which we live need not be a jungle. Jungle ethics are not the ethics of a scholarship which gives the mind of man the sovereign leadership of human affairs in justice, when the wisdom of building a society of good living is the determined intent of the state. Jungle politics cannot inspire a statesmanship which will build the good society. The civilized statesman is the only one who has enduring power. The trigger of political action is on relief. The aim is not necessarily on a better way of living. The American way of life in which there is economic security and spiritual freedom is today denied millions of fellow American citizens. The cancer of unemployment is havoc to social ideals. The American way is the way where the standards of a quality civilization are constantly the aim of patriotism and civic action. A nation on relief is un-American. An unplanned social and economic system is not defining the great ideals of life, liberty, and happiness in the twentieth century.

Scholarship is the great tradition of using the intel-

ligence to gain a larger measure of freedom in human and social action. Each age has its own tyrannies which threaten the way of reason. The individual in each age can accept the tyranny of his generation's making, becoming a serf on the contemporary domain. Yet through the years there has been the daring scholarship of reason which has given to man and nations a broader tradition of freedom of choice. "The free use of intelligence and knowledge," says Leonard Woolf, "both individually and socially, gives a community science and the control of its physical environment; material prosperity; the spiritual courage, as Pericles says, to face facts; the power of conquering fear and its savagery and so of becoming humane."

Chaos has continued its jungle concatenations, but now and again the protection of human personality has been advanced. The larger interests of public affairs have here and there won victories over vested privilege. It is strange that scholarship has had to look often to private philanthropy for bed and board. This has sometimes been an unholy alliance, unhealthful for a scholarship which would penetrate the injustices of a complicated social order. And again, philanthropy has assumed often the smug authority of the patron. Philanthropy is not the wisest teacher of democracy. Democracy must create its own conditions of freedom. Democratic institutions of learning may welcome gifts of wealth, but democracy can give a new meaning to philanthropy. A bolder scholarship can declare in a democracy the great task of education must be borne

by taxation. Education is a function of government and as such must be liberally supported. Philanthropy has been an ambulance in democracy. With its enormous social prestige and financial power it should be a pioneer, not a subsidizing agent of educational relief.

It is desperately disquieting in these days of tension when persuasion should have power among nations that war is accepted as the inevitable arbiter of a world of insecurity. This is a tragic confession for the mind of man to make. What has the pursuit of truth by scholars at Rome, at Heidelberg, at Harvard, at Oxford, profited if the bodies of young Romans rot on the fields of Ethiopia and the spirit of youth taught the ultimate despairing truth that force is the blind tyrant of all life? What will say the Veterans of Future Wars of their college professors of 1936?

Today the long line of academic processions reflects the pageantry of American university and college life. From the cap and gown, with *Alma Mater* yet echoing across the campus, America's youth join the tramping hosts of the unemployed of the mightiest political and economic nation on earth. If scholarship is in an ivory castle it had best remain there. For soon, if there is not a better way of life for the masses of mankind, fear will destroy the fabric of politics and economics in a world of insecurity.

The imminent danger to scholarship in this era of insecurity is the powerful hold that force or unreason has in human affairs. The mind of man bewildered retreats from the battlefield where truth is being worsted

by the temporary victories of fanaticism, and error in such confusion woos the troubled spirit of nations. Scholarship has no armament but truth and reason and intelligence. In the civilized periods of human history man at his noblest has given truth and reason and intelligence magistral place in the direction of religion and politics and economics. The crisis in every civilization has been when the forces of magic and quackery, disguised in each thousand years, but ever characterized by belief in the unreason of things, rise to begin a new crusade for the tyranny of chaos. Is such a period upon the world now?

Scholarship has in the United States reached the decisive, the critical period of development. The life of America is in crisis. Scholarship has never had its alleged ivory castles. In fact, there are the burned bodies of men who loved truth more than life, and the exiled lovers of truth who through the centuries have walked to doom. It may well be said that a dangerous age for scholars is the present. The world crisis includes the crisis of American civilization, and when civilization is in peril scholarship must live dangerously. When the destiny of a world power in freedom is at stake, the way of reason must be all the more insistently pointed out.

Scholarship must accept its social obligations to see the world of insecurity in which all live today. The wounded spirit of brave men and women needs its power to heal. The hunger of a nation needs the direct approach of lovers of truth who seek to create eco-

nomic sanity out of the present unbalanced social system.

The laboratory is impersonal in its research. The test-tube is not an agency of propaganda. Yet with academic seductiveness, science gives dignity to research. The ends of this research should be social. It is an indictment of scholarship and science that far too often the material results of research have benefited the interests of the few and have not been used to raise the general standard of well-being for the many. Perhaps physical science over a long period of time is more devastating to so-called established values than the disquietudes of sociological investigators are to entrenched social prejudices. Each field of scholarship has its large debt to pay to the needs of men, and by serving with searching diligence these needs, scholarship is ennobled.

THE ETHICS OF INTERNATIONALISM

I

THERE are few who look back upon the last twenty-two years, 1914–1936, with any pride in the conscious achievement of man's purpose to create conditions of progress and security for the human race. At least, the years have strained the foundations of social institutions. At most, there have been here and there brave assaults against folly, with heroism from those unknown who would not accept a pitying defeat of despair.

One pious blessing now is that surely there is no silly optimism. Courage has never been lacking. But today no shallow wit hails the confusion of men's minds and the dreadful uncertainty of nations with the fool's faith that because there has been so much disaster there is no worse to come. There can be a worse to come if it is wanted, or rather worse will come, if it is not, with daring ingenuity, planned against by better designs of living and action.

Defeatism has long since lost any attraction, even for the sophomoric minded. Cynicism has little left for cleverness to enjoy. The wastelands of the world's agony and frustration are not pleasant to look upon. There are many who, by decent achievement, are

steeled to face the present as a howling wilderness, and who forecast no larger area in human affairs when reason is the arbiter; but they will not call this contemporary madness of greed within a nation and greed among nations, breeding civil war and international anarchy, "peace."

The present period of change is characterized by a healthier understanding of the obstacles men have put in the way of their working out their destiny in peace. Realism is at a higher level. Belief in international political magic, a naive faith that simply a conference is conclusive, as in Mr. Will Rogers's untoward humor; a sublime acceptance of the oratory of peace by fiat, suggestive of Mr. Borah—these types of belief in political magic in international affairs are now almost safely back with ancestral constitutional medicine men. What survives would be picturesque if it were not found too often in the United States Senate, among professional patrioteers, and among honest people who prefer to see foreign policy in the low firelight of frontier Indian raids, rather than read the nation's destiny in the trade markets of the seven seas. There are no frontiers for the needs of 120,000,000 American people. They are in a world which cannot swallow itself up.

There is no magic trick by which peace can come to nations. It will be the result of many efforts made by governments, and the slow breaking down of ancient habits of resort to force. The decline of faith in violence is the measure of civilization. When reason be-

comes persuasive, history becomes civilized. The verdict on the League of Nations in the minds of certain observers is an interesting example of thinking on the collective system of maintaining peace. The examples of Japan and Germany and Italy are quickly cited to prove the failure of the League. This is too easy an explanation. It is too short a cut away from the difficulty of establishing conditions of peace in this century. Such thinking betrays an immature view toward history and the long-time range of human affairs.

The recent statement of Professor Manley O. Hudson is a more sophisticated, and at the same time, more philosophic interpretation. "The formation of a general judgment of the collective system of maintaining peace," says Professor Hudson, "cannot be based merely on the fulfillment or non-fulfillment of hopes entertained fifteen years ago. Some of those hopes may have been born of blindness to forces with which encounter was inevitable. A sharp break with the past does not destroy immediately the conceptions and policies which have ruled the past. Disillusionment is the usual price of failure to anticipate failure. For years I have been predicting that the League would fail in some of the crises which would confront it, and now that failures have come I do not propose to abandon the faith which I have held in the efficacy of intelligent effort. A return to the prewar freedom of states to go to war as and when they please, would be, for me, inconsistent with all of the interests of the international community of this twentieth century. The only

alternative is some development of the collective system, and I am not rash enough to attempt to foresee that development apart from growth within the organization now maintained by fifty-nine states of the world.

"The Covenant will live not as so much black ink on white paper, nor as a gift from the harassed and uninspired men who made the questionable peace of Paris in 1919, nor as a series of obligations undertaken by so many states in a moment of righteous yearning. It will live in ever-changing conceptions and ever-growing institutions which respond to the needs of international society. The ideas which dominated international relations for previous centuries will die, but they will die hard. It took two centuries to enthrone the idea of the King's peace in medieval England. I think we need not despair if it takes many decades to establish the new conception of the world's peace of this twentieth century."

Belief in international economic magic also is widespread—that is, the often expressed and more often unconsciously felt belief that war can be the answer to economic ills. Because of its former special healthfulness this belief has kept up an irritating vitality even on its deathbed. The facts are simply stated with regard to this belief in international economic magic. The nineteenth century did fairly well by the war business. The aftermath of Napoleon was not even settled diplomatically at the Congress of Vienna. Through the century there were wars of conquest and

unification, laying the broad basis for the race of armaments which inevitably made international anarchy an accepted fact. Lust was in the strength of nations. And in their mightiest power they felt the delirium which, when ended, made emperors forgotten men, and created within nations the cancers of domestic discord and war's legitimate brother—unemployment. But war was not enough. That was one phase of international magic. Peace could be more hellish than war. So Versailles was the mart for nations. And nations, grown subtle in a new language of gain, found peace more disintegrating than war, and in the lean, stupid, avaricious years of war-in-peace, nations have created the bright colorful prospects of war. They little know that this more mature belief in the economic magic of war will bring the hideous reality of death to factory, legislature and home.

II

It is well to ask in a disorganized world if there is any valid basis for a belief in security in the isolation of nations and peoples. The illusions of security in isolation are grandiose. The phrases strut across Senate floors, yet millions starve in the land of the free and—is it the home of the brave, when the intelligence needed to build security for the American people is not diligently given to twentieth-century economic facts?

The contradiction, on one hand, of a proud scientific attitude toward the world in which we live, and, on

the other hand, the groveling acceptance of man's incapacity to keep on civilized terms with his neighbors is one of the profoundly disquieting symptoms of these times. The complacency of accepting the great ignorant suzerainties of science which headlong plunge industrial, cultural, and political institutions into terrifying change, without a directed control, indicts the common sense of the American people. Enormous industrial advance has been allowed to stand unchallenged in its social obligations. The modern state has been servile before the mounting claims of so-called scientific achievement, not even using the primary challenge of self-preservation to science's claim of competency to build the material environment of well-being. The twentieth century has created the most colossal armaments of military destruction which threaten political peace in every land. Budgets in post-depression years have outdistanced the now seemingly small outlay of the early twentieth-century international race of building instruments for man's destruction. Armament costs have been only one part of democracy's struggle to survive under conditions of freedom. The security war has been alleged to offer is the most expensive luxury of the modern nation. None has escaped.

The twentieth century has created the vast economic problem of unemployment, war's devastating aftermath. Insecurity is accepted as inevitable by hundreds of millions. The well-being of the citizens of

nations is nowhere the essential condition of the survival of the economic or the political system. Scientific achievement has not to its credit the feeding and clothing and housing of the citizens of the world. They are dispossessed in bodies, and these bodies have become the war fodder of the twentieth century. How deep the spiritual dispossession of the mind of man is in this age, no honest person dares long contemplate.

III

It often appears that mankind everywhere has received orders to retreat from popular forms of government and the hard gained positions of democratic civilization. The retreat has been ordered, but there are many who refuse to hear the command. Yet on every hand there are the counsellors of reaction who say there is no way out, with confidence, in the rule of reason and the reign of law. They suggest these loyalties of mind have lost their hold on institutions of government, and no longer can win the allegiance of realists in a world of confusion. The state must be the end of all existence. Thus fascism would teach democracies the denial of the rights of the citizens in a political society.

There is a direct connection between fascism and international anarchy. The seeds of dictatorship are sown in the ground of national reprisals. They ripen in the warming days of economic conflict among states,

and finally come to full growth when dictators with brutal and savage power raise huge armies to conceal internal disruptions and to unite their people against external foes.

The specious oaths of loyalty by citizens to a totalitarian state, behind which stands the dictator, does not hide the essential emptiness of purpose in the citizenship of these madly nationalistic states. All purpose is the will of the state. Man as citizen is dispossessed. There is the gaudy display of parades, the dulling comfort of being a part of a mass, conscious only of a unity which does not admit separation of interest. The citizen in the fascist state cannot be concerned in the larger consciousness of fulfilling his own inherent being. He must unite his whole of self to the state. He becomes a tiny cell in a great mass. This mass-consciousness is, from the view of genuine patriotism, an immoral relationship of citizens with the state; and it is without benefit of any ethical significance in the relationship of citizen with citizen. There is no genuine community of interest. It is devoid of a voluntary giving of intelligent and enthusiastic service to the state, which would be given because the state is organizing and administering the interests of its citizens at the highest common level. Citizenship under dictatorship becomes a conspiracy of men living in fear. The state becomes a syndicate of racketeers.

The World War was not ended before there was one of the great cataclysmic revolutions of history. The whole world was profoundly affected in its polit-

ical alignments. The economic consequences are still marked up daily on the exchanges of national capitals. The impact of chaotic military and nationalistic ambitions, organized for a brief time under the aegis of the international compact of war, today shakes the civilized world into fear.

Democracy and revolution have often been joined in the slow march of man to the community of persuasion. Men have fought, not counting the bloody cost of force, only hoping the result would lift their slaughtered youth and bodies to the altar of ennobling sacrifice. But no one who today hears the air filled with ships of destruction or who sees in the laboratories of nations the front trench of death armaments will believe that such facts imply a respect for human personality which alone makes life tolerable. Democracy with audacity in its accent has hurled a proud defiance against the cheapness of human life. The democratic state has no other claim to allegiance than the fact that the citizen can identify his high aims with the purposes of the good state. The ethics of a nationalism which gives any dignity to human life is the ethics of an internationalism which builds upon a world where men are safe to call their souls their own.

It is difficult to believe that either the form or the spirit of democracy can long survive in any nation under world conditions of international anarchy. The indictment of democratic government has been given with increasing assurance since the World War. The modern tyrant derides the processes of representative

institutions. The war system has not protected the democratic state. In fact war has made possible the dictators of Europe, and world uncertainty has shaken the foundations of belief in democracies everywhere. International anarchy paralyzes the statesmanship in every nation because international anarchy is a constant threat to peace. Since 1929 the United States has undergone revolutionary economic changes. The institutions of government have been through one crisis after another. It is commonplace to remark that the depression has cost more than the war. It has been necessary since the war for the nations of the world to deal with internal difficulties of trade and unemployment and relief. The time has been reached when the lessons of international anarchy should be learned with regard to the tremendous effect unstable international relations have upon the domestic policy of every government in the world. International crisis government makes national crisis government. Professor Lindsay Rogers has well said: "All this goes to the question of American representative institutions doing an efficient job internally. But if democratic governments are to overcome the dangers that threaten them, they must do a good job internationally as well. They must be able to create and carry out policies which will permit enough political appeasement to foster economic recovery. Economic dangers pave the way for arbitrary government. Arbitrary governments so alarm each other and governments less arbitrary that international measures to alleviate economic distress seem to be im-

possible. This is the vicious circle. Only by breaking it can representative governments show that they are competent to deal with the crisis that confronts them."

IV

Nationalism as we know it in its present development was largely created by the nation-building states of the nineteenth century. Wars remade the map of Europe in the nineteenth century, and in the second decade of the present century frenzied states broke the peace of the world. The political, economic, and spiritual costs of the war from 1914–1918 can never be fully known. The war forces of all the nations so mercilessly drove combatants and civilians that there has been since no adequate energy to build strong foundations of enduring peace. Yet today, with the awful cost of the war fresh in memory, the civilized world in every part of it lives under the constant menace of declarations of war. Strong currents of nationalism are seen everywhere. The very passion of postwar nationalism will destroy any hope of democratic peace or of international concord. The practical problem before all nations is to harness the constructive power in nationalism to create solidarity within a nation and make possible peace among nations. This is not a vague appeal to an internationalism that will override the individual state, but it is a belief that the largest interests of each nation are best served in keeping the peace of the world.

It is well then for men of good will to give their

thoughts to the problem of creating the conditions of peace in the world that would make it possible for all nations to be good neighbors. A practical expression of this spirit was given on March 2, 1936, in the signing of agreements between Panama and the United States. By this action the United States showed its willingness to begin a better day of friendship among the Americas. It will be recalled that President Arias of Panama and President Roosevelt issued a joint statement on October 17, 1933, establishing the broad lines of a policy of cooperation. Since that time there have been formal and informal negotiations between the representatives of Panama and the United States government. The State Department's announcement on March 2, 1936, constitutes a splendid statement that might well be the text for further negotiations among all the American states. The announcement of the State Department declared:

"In the course of these negotiations all of the differences between the two governments have been discussed thoroughly and frankly by the representatives of both countries, and there has been apparent throughout a sincere effort by the negotiators to approach these problems in a constructive spirit and with a mutual comprehension of the point of view of the other side. Both governments have been inspired by a desire to cooperate for their mutual welfare, and have constantly exhibited a spirit of good will and mutual respect for each other's rights. It has been the purpose

of the United States to eliminate, in so far as possible, all causes of friction and all grounds of legitimate complaint on the part of Panama, but without sacrificing any rights deemed essential by this government for the efficient operation, maintenance, sanitation and protection of the canal.

"By bringing to a successful conclusion today these laborious negotiations, another most significant landmark has been established in the history of Panamanian-American relations, and one more manifestation has been given of the 'good neighbor policy' of President Roosevelt. The agreements signed today constitute a logical and desirable development of the remarks made by President Roosevelt on April 12, 1933, in an address before the special session of the governing board of the Pan American Union on the occasion of the celebration of Pan American Day, as follows:

" 'Friendship among nations as among individuals calls for constructive efforts to muster the forces of humanity in order that an atmosphere of close understanding and cooperation may be cultivated. It involves mutual obligations and responsibilities, for it is only by sympathetic respect for the rights of others and scrupulous fulfilment of the corresponding obligations by each member of the community that a true fraternity can be maintained.

" 'The essential qualities of a true Pan Americanism must be the same as those which constitute a good neighbor, namely, mutual understanding and, through

such understanding, a sympathetic appreciation of the other's point of view. It is only in this manner that we can hope to build up a system of which confidence, friendship and good will are the cornerstones.' "

President Roosevelt has here well defined the high aims of a collective cooperative effort to establish peace. The task may be less difficult on the American continent, but it is the unfinished task of this war-ruled century.

The ethics of internationalism are primarily concerned with the rule of reason in human affairs. The ideal in science has been a world of reason and order. The last place where the scientific method has been operative is in the field of human relations. The rule of reason would certainly be to apply the scientific temper to a world sorely beset with troubles. In a world of plaguing conflicts of national interests the rule of reason is the arbiter that may restore the sanity of every nation. The needs of nations have not been wisely looked to and the result is tension and conflict. The question follows: Is it possible for a wisdom of civilization's needs to be created out of the anarchy of self-pivoted national interest? It is certain, if there is to be security for the nations of the world, that national interest will have to be interpreted in a broad way. The basic needs of civilization are here involved.

In 1934, at the College of William and Mary in Virginia, one of the great Americans of this age gave the warning to those who would narrow the destiny of the American people. Secretary of State Hull said:

"In recent years a dangerous conception has become too prevalent, a strange economic conception that a nation can live to itself and virtually dispense with customary international relations. It is significant that none of the statesmen who made history in the period before and during the Revolution, and who, during a long later period, were connected with the Federal Government, had any thought that this country could or should lead a self-contained existence. All of the evidence is directly to the contrary. They were devoted to their own land, but even though communication was slow with other lands, they completely realized that it was not possible for this country to develop without commercial, social and cultural relations with Europe."

His words were apt two years ago. They are now of even stronger force. Their practical application would do much to lift the political depression which has paralyzed the will of democracies throughout the world. There is today a strong tendency to overestimate the irrational and the spirit of anarchy in world affairs. The daily press is filled with ominous words from the leaders who guide public affairs. From England comes the news that the military program will have no budgeted cost but that the millions that are needed will be used and that more will be voted to fulfill the ends of the race for armaments. Any allegiance to theoretical disarmaments is gone and the British government accepts as fact the race of armaments. France makes its pact with the Soviets. Italy

and Germany join to abandon the Locarno Pact. Conditions in the Far East have added to the chaotic state of international affairs.

The acceptance of international anarchy is a dangerous indication of the exhaustion of statesmanship in the world. It means that the law of the jungle will take the place of the reign of law. It means that no nation is secure in a world of insecurity. The ethics of internationalism implies collective security. The advance of the rational and scientific spirit is a compelling force and it should be used to promote the interest of all nations. In national affairs and international relations a larger place must be given to the rule of reason if there is to be any foundation laid for modern civilization. The defeatism which is so powerful both in national problems and in international politics will have to be met with courage. Professor Merriam has well said: "It is easy to exaggerate the advance of the rational and scientific spirit in politics, but it is equally easy to underestimate the progress of education in political affairs."

V

The ethics of internationalism demands today a skepticism of political, economic, and cultural nationalism. The peace of the world is at stake. Nations cannot blindly go their way to destruction. They are made up of men, women, and children with human interests and hopes. The world in anarchy is a brutalizing and terrifying world. The supreme challenge of statesman-

ship in the twentieth century is to build institutions of peace. The nations of the world cannot isolate themselves in safety. The political evolution of seventy nations who make up this world forbids any possible solitariness in international affairs. The ethics of internationalism will finally create collective security and in this security the individual nations will find the surest guarantee of their security.

Economic nationalism has wrought havoc with the commerce of the world. Artificial barriers to trade have been set up the world round. The result of this policy of economic self-sufficiency has almost bankrupt the world. The progress of trade agreements worked out by Secretary of State Hull is one hopeful sign. "In the past two years the United States," says Mr. Hull, "has led the way in working for fairer trading conditions between nations. In the past year and a half we have carried on negotiations with nine of the Latin-American republics. Trade agreements have already been successfully concluded with Cuba, Haiti, Brazil, Colombia and Honduras. As soon as circumstances permit, I trust that negotiations may be inaugurated with all of the other Latin-American republics and thus permit the whole Western Hemisphere to be included in the program. Concrete results of such concerted effort to restore international trade are already evident. In the case of Cuba the results have more than justified expectations. During the first fifteen months of the operation of the trade agreement with that country, the total foreign trade between the United

States and Cuba increased over $100,000,000, representing an increase of more than 100 per cent. With continued good will and cooperation I feel sure that the progress we have already made in combatting the depression by building up trade among nations will continue at an accelerated pace. The policy of the good neighbor among the Americas is no longer a hope, no longer an objective; it is a reality, vital, active, and effective. A new era of friendliness, understanding, economic peace, cultural cooperation and American solidarity has been inaugurated, and it is my earnest hope that the good work may be carried on."

The ethics of internationalism asserts the essential unity of the culture of all races. There are no boundaries for the spirit of man. There is too little of achievement in the story of mankind for any nation to boast of its cultural self-sufficiency. The future of human welfare and happiness lies in an expanding consciousness among all peoples of the universality of art, religion, music and culture. The ethics of internationalism takes into account the whole story of human achievement in every land and in every tongue. Its main concern is with the universal problem of creating the conditions which will give man's will and intelligence a chance to function.